DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 112 712 HE 006 621

AUTHOR	Hodgkinson, Harold; And Others
TITLE	A Manual for the Evaluation of Innovative Programs and Practices in Higher Education.
INSTITUTION	California Univ., Berkeley. Center for Research and Development in Higher Education.
PUB DATE	74
NOTE	209p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$10.78 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	Counseling Programs; Delivery Systems; *Educational Innovation; Educational Resources; *Higher Education; *Instructional Innovation; *Instrumentation; Manuals; Multimedia Instruction; Peer Counseling; *Resource Guides

ABSTRACT

Evaluation procedures are presented in this sourcebook for individuals and institutions involved in innovative programs. The major evaluation instruments available are described, including the name of the instrument, its acronym, respondents on whom it has been used, the items and scales contained in the instrument, the instrument's response set, and the various norm groups for which correlation data are available. A listing is provided of current innovative programs and practices in higher education, organized around four themes: (1) audience innovations (new groups in higher education's student body); (2) content innovations (interdisciplinary social science programs, etc.); (3) teaching and counseling innovations (contract learning, peer tutoring, etc.); (4) delivery system innovations (cluster colleges, course by newspaper, etc.). (LBH)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

ED112712

A MANUAL FOR THE EVALUATION OF INNOVATIVE PROGRAMS AND PRACTICES IN HIGHER EDUCATION

Harold Hodgkinson

Julie Hurst

Howard Levine

Steve Brint

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE 006 621

Center for Research and Development
in Higher Education
-*-
University of California, Berkeley
-*-
1974

CONTENTS

Introduction, *1*

Part I: The Instruments, *5*

Student Instructional Report (SIR), *6*

Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI), *7*

Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI), *8*

College Characteristics Index (CCI), *9*

College Characteristics Analysis (CCA), *10*

College and University Environmental Scales, 2nd Edition (CUES), *11*

Inventory of College Activities (ICA), *12*

Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT), *13*

ACE Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) and Student Information Form (SIF), *14*

Institutional Self-Study Survey (ISS), *15*

Higher Education Measurement and Evaluation Kit (HEMEK), Kits I-IV, *16*

Descriptive Assessment of Learning Environment (DALE), *24*

Davis Student Survey, *25*

Evaluating University Teaching, *26*

Faculty Characteristics Questionnaire, Experimental Form I, *28*

Structured Interviews and University Records, *29*

Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI), *30*

Course Comments Questionnaire (CCQ), *31*

Experience of College Questionnaire (ECQ), *32*

Criteria of Student Success, *33*

Course Evaluation Questionnaire, University of Illinois (CEQ), *34*

Part II: The Innovations and Their Evaluation, *35*

I. Audience Innovations, *36*

- General Evaluation Strategies for Audience Innovations, *37*
- Low Achievers, *38*
- Ethnic Minority Students, *41*
- Working Class Students, First College Generation, *44*
- Adults Returning to School after Several or Many Years, *47*
- Adults Returning for Technical, Vocational Update; Company Programs, *50*
- Professionals--Supplemental and "Continuing" Training, *53*

II. Content Innovations, *55*

- General Evaluation Strategies for Content Innovations, *56*
- Ethnic Studies, *57*
- "New" Culture Programs, *61*
- Environmental Studies, *63*
- Women's Studies, *66*

  - Community Programs, Community Work, *69*
  - Urban Studies, *71*
  - "Contemporary Political and Social Issues" and "Unified Sciences" Programs; Issue-Oriented Interdisciplinary Programs, *74*
  - Other Interdisciplinary Programs ("Peace Studies," "Non-Western Studies," "Futuristics," etc.), *77*

III. Teaching and Counselling Innovations, *80*

  - General Evaluation Strategies for Teaching and Counselling Innovations, *81*
  - Contract Learning, *82*
  - "Systems" or "Behavioral Objectives" Approach (Programmed Courses), *85*
  - Independent Study, *88*
  - Team Teaching in Interdisciplinary Courses, *91*
  - Encounter or "T-Group" Personal Exploration Teaching, *93*
  - Large Lecture Classes Broken Down into Small Seminars, *96*
  - Honors Seminars for Below-Senior-Level Students, *99*
  - Games and Game Simulation, *101*
  - Mixed Media Presentations, Student Presentations, and Guest Lecturers, *103*
  - Apprenticeship, Internship, and Field Study, *105*
  - Study Abroad, *107*
  - Faculty Symposiums and Credit for Participation in College Governance, *109*
  - Peer Counselling and Peer Tutoring, *112*
  - Special Intensive Counselling Programs, *114*
  - Cluster Counseling, *116*

"Mentorship Teaching", *118*

Office of the Ombudsman, *121*

All Pass-Fail Grading, Self-Evaluations, *123*

Pass-Fail Grading Outside of Major, *125*

Cumulative Portfolio, *127*

Comprehensive Examinations, *129*

Outside Examiners, *131*

Micro-teaching Evaluations, *133*

Peer Teaching Evaluations, *135*

Faculty Growth Programs, *137*

Faculty Retreats, *139*

Fixed-Term Tenure Plan, *141*

Competency-Based Learning Programs, *143*

IV. Delivery Systems Innovations, *145*

General Evaluation Strategies for Delivery Systems Innovations, *146*

Cluster Colleges, *147*

Universities Without Walls, *149*

Mini-Colleges or "Experimental" Colleges, *152*

Optive Colleges, *155*

International Colleges, *158*

Living-Learning Units, *160*

Theme Houses, *163*

Three-Year Baccalaureate Programs, *166*

Doctor of Arts, Master of Philosophy, Specialist, and Other New Degrees, *169*

External Degree Programs, *171*

Change from Credit-Hour to Course Credit, *173*

Intersession or 4-1-4 Calendar, *175*

Trimester Calendar Plan, *177*

Modular Course Plan, *180*

Varied Semester Length Calendar, *183*

College Presessions, *185*

Single Course Schedule (Intensive Courses), *187*

Courses by Newspaper, *189*

Computer-Aided Learning, *191*

TV-Satellite Assisted Learning, *193*

Auto-Tutorials and Learning Centers, *196*

Credit for Life/Work Experience, *200*

INTRODUCTION

We believe that this sourcebook can be of utility to many individuals and institutions that have begun innovative programs and now wish to develop effective evaluation procedures. The field of evaluation is changing so rapidly that we cannot claim that this work is anything more than a first step in providing an evaluation "Yellow Pages" for those who can make use of it.

Here is how to use this sourcebook.

There are two basic sections to the material:

1. A description of the major evaluation instruments now available. This includes the name of the instrument, its initials for easy use in later sections, the respondents on whom it has been used, the items and scales contained in the instrument, the instrument's response set (Multiple choice, true-false, etc.) and the various norm groups for which correlation data is available.
2. A listing of current innovative programs and practices in higher education, organized around four themes:
    1. Audience innovations (new groups in higher education's student body)
    2. Content innovations (interdisciplinary social science programs, etc.)
    3. Teaching and counselling innovations (contract learning, peer tutoring, etc.)
    4. Delivery system innovations (cluster colleges, courses by newspaper, etc.)

Each of the four sections in Part 2 is organized as follows:

a. First is a page of general evaluation material which is applicable to each of the specific innovations that will follow.

b. Next is a sheet describing the nature of the innovation, the major characteristics which can be evaluated, and a brief listing of *some* of the evaluation issues and questions which can be raised concerning the innovation. Note that these check points are by no means complete, but simply give some clues as to what questions can be raised.

c. A second page for each innovation lists (1) some institutions that have carried out the innovation; (2) the strategic nature of the evaluation (audience, teaching-learning strategies, counselling strategies, or the logistic concerns of "time-space-value" strategies); and (3) the sections of the various instruments available as described in part one that could be used to evaluate the innovation's success.

In seeking about for a single source of descriptive information on innovative programs and practices, we came upon Ann Heiss' book done for the Carnegie Commission, *An Inventory of Academic Innovation and Reform* (Carnegie Commission, Berkeley, 1973). Any such book is bound to become outdated in terms of institutions listed, but we found the listing of innovations and their descriptions to be useful, and have referred the reader to that book for more detailed descriptions of some of the innovative activities.

Although the reader can simply use the index of innovations and turn only to those in which the person is interested, we strongly recommend that the instruments in part one be surveyed first to give the reader some familiarity with that they are and what they measure before proceeding to part two. We would be very interested in hearing from readers concerning what aspects of this book are useful and what could be done to improve it. We hope that it will be useful to students and faculty as well as administrators, and to academic deans, presidents and department chairpersons as well as institutional research officers.

The senior author would like to commend his three colleagues for perservering in what threatened to become a jungle of ambiguity, Morris Kleinschmidt who managed to plan out the charts and did the typing, Russ Edgerton and Martin Corry who made the project possible in Washington, and Martin Kramer who thought we could do it. As always, however, errors of omission and commission are the responsibility of the senior author.

Harold L. Hodgkinson

Berkeley, California
February, 1974

PART I: THE INSTRUMENTS

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Student Instructional Report (SIR) ETS	Student assessment of college courses & instruction. Used to produce info. for instructors, and gather info. to help students select courses.	Students	39 items		None.
			20 course, exams, student-teacher interaction, teaching & techniques	1 - 5 rating (not applicable - strongly disagree)	In future: by subject fields, by types of classes, by different colleges.
			11 course	multiple choice	
			8 class texts	1 - 5 rating (N/A to poor)	
			10 for supplementary use		

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Institutional Functioning Inventory (IFI) ETS	Used to illuminate how faculty, students, & administrators perceive such aspects of an institution as its admin. policies, teaching practices, academic and extra-curricular programs. Provides a means by which a college can describe itself in terms of a number of characteristics judged to be of importance in higher education.	Faculty (Normal use) *Students *Administrators *Complete first half of inventory	32 items 11 12-item scales 1. Intell./Aes. Extracurricular 2. Freedom 3. Human Diversity 4. Concern for Improvement of Society 5. Concern for Undergraduate Education 6. Democratic Governance 7. Meeting Local Needs 8. Self-Study & Planning 9. Concern for Advancing of Knowledge 10. Concern for Innovation 11. Institutional Esprit	yes/no/don't know	Correlations between scales & published institutional data; i.e., number of library books, faculty-student ratio, p. 21. & CUES scales & student protest factors & incidence of protest over various issues Correlations between respondent groups. Norm group institutions. 7 Public Level II & III 4 Public Level IV 9 Private Independent Levels II & III 5 Private Catholic Level II & III 10 Private Protestant Level II & III 1 Private Independent Level IV 1 Private Catholic Levels II & III

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Institutional Goals Inventory (IGI) ETS	Instrument reflects goal conceptions in higher education. Will aid in defining educational goals, establishing priorities among these goals, and giving direction to an institution's present & future planning.	Faculty Grad students Undergrads Administrators Presidents Trustees	20 4-item goal areas 10 miscellaneous statements Output Goals: Academic Developmt. Intellectual Orient Indiv. Personal Development Humanism/Altruism Cultural/Aesthetic Traditional Relig. Vocational Prep. Research Meeting Local Needs Public Service Social Egalitarianism Social Criticism/ Activism Process Goals: Freedom Democratic Gov. Community Intell/Aes. Environment Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency 7 background items	1 - 5 rating (of no importance to extremely important) is should be	Manual being written now. California institutional goals results available for: University of California California State Universities and Colleges Community colleges Private institutions

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
College Characteristics Index (CCI) Pace-Stern	Measure of environmental press. The 300 statements describe activities, policies, procedures, attitudes, and impressions which might be characteristic of various colleges. These measures of press are judged to correspond to personality needs. Tool to measure environments as a whole and/or comparisons between institutions.	Students (Juniors or seniors)	30 10-item scales 1) Abasement 2) Achievement 3) Adaptiveness 4) Affiliation 5) Aggression 6) Change-Sameness 7) Collectivity-Disjunctivity 8) Counteraction 9) Deference 10) Dominance 11) Ego Achievement 12) Emotionality-Placidity 13) Energy-Passivity 14) Exhibition 15) Fantasied Achievement 16) Harmavoidance 17) Humanism 18) Impulsion-Deliberation 19) Narcissism 20) Nurturance 21) Objectivity-Projectivity 22) Order 23) Play 24) Pragmatism 25) Reflectiveness 26) Scientism 27) Sentience (elementary consciousness) 28) Sex 29) Succorance-Autonomy 30) Understanding	yes/no	(Don't have information.)

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
College Characteristics Analysis (CCA) Pace	Regarded as a supplementary and complementary device to the CCI. 1) Purpose is to enable students to report about the particular part of the university they know best--academic field or area, and students they associate with closely. Instrument is tool to estimate the characteristics of campus subcultures and compare their differences. 2) Purpose is to provide means of estimating extent to which different parts of the environment operate in harmony or at cross-purposes.	Students (juniors or seniors)	180 items spread across 4 item classifications referring to goals, objectives, and major emphases of environment. 1) Humanistic (Intellectual Reflective) 15 items-Admin. community 15 items-Academic community 15 items-Student community 2) Scientific (Intellectual Competitive) (same breakdown as above) 3) Practical (Vocational Status-Oriented) (same as above) 4) Welfare (Citizenship, Social Responsibility)	true/false	Estimated average scores on scales by each environmental community (p. 16).
			College Experience Questionnaire 11 items on educ. objectives	1 - 4 rating (very much to not very much)	
			11 items on extra-curricular activities	1 - 4 rating (much to none)	
			4 items on satisfactions	multiple choice	

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
College and University Environmental Scales, Second Edition (CUES) Pace	Tool to help define the prevailing intellectual-social-cultural atmosphere of the college. The scales are intended to reflected ways in which colleges differ from one another in organizational structure, community of interest, degree of social, political, & aesthetic awareness, etc. Purpose is to aid colleges & universities in defining the atmosphere or intellectual-social-cultural climate of the campus.	Students (second-semester sophomores, juniors, seniors)	5 basic scales (20 items each) 1) Practicality 2) Community 3) Awareness 4) Propriety 5) Scholarship 2 subscales: 1) Campus Morale (22 items) 2) Quality of Teaching and Faculty-Student Relationships (11 items)	true/false	100 accredited 4-year colleges varying in type and geographical locale. 10(SLA) Highly selective LA colleges 10(SU) Highly selective universities 20(GLA) General liberal arts colleges 20(GU) General universities (public & private) 10(SC) State colleges & other universities 10(TC) Teachers colleges & others with major emphasis on teacher education 10(DLA) Strongly denominational LA colleges 10(ES) Colleges & universities emphasizing engineering & the sciences. Correlations: CUES scores & college aptitudes, pp. 47-53 & Astin's freshman input factors & educ. & career plans of NORC surveys & student attitudes & activities--NORC & institutional statistics--NORC & Astin's institutional factors.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Inventory of College Activities (ICA) Astin	Purpose is to identify & measure some important differences among college environments.	Students (finishing freshmen)	400 items	yes/no	246 universities (summer '62) 30,570 students
			77 items concerning college image	multiple choice open-ended	
			48 items concerning personal characteristics	1 - 5 rating (desirable to undesirable)	
			Remainder concerning stimulus factors in four environments: 1) Peer. Competitiveness, organized dating, independence, cohesiveness, informal dating, & 10 other non-interpersonal factors. 2) Classroom. Instructors' behavior, student behavior, overall organization of class. 3) Administrative. Drinking, aggression, heterosexual activity, cheating. 4) Physical. Spread of campus dorm counselor.	1 - 3 rating (frequently to not at all)	

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Environmental Assessment Technique (EAT) Astin, Holland	Measurement of the psychological climate of an institution by students' past achievements & vocational choices.	Entering freshmen.	19 indices for determination of student attitudes, grouped into 7 areas: 1) Academic 2) Scientific 3) Artistic 4) Musical 5) Verbal 6) Literary 7) Social 3 items concerning educational and vocational plans 3 items, student background information Institutional characteristics: 1) Size 2) Masculinity (% males) 3) Affluence I (per student operating budget) 4) Affluence II (estimated selectivity--high aptitude)	multiple choice	248 colleges (fall, 1961) 127,212 freshmen

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
American Council on Education Cooperative Institutional Research Program (CIRP) Student Information Form (SIF) ACE-CIRP	Longitudinal study of entering freshmen to assess students' backgrounds, past behaviors, and attitudes.	Entering freshmen. Follow-up seniors.	College activities dimensions: Peer environment. Classroom environment. Administrative environment. College image.		Annual national norm reports by: Type of institution & control. Geographic region. Sex & racial composition. Tables show % ages of students responding to various items on SIF.

'INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Institutional Self-Study Survey-ACT (ISS)	Developed to help colleges & universities assess themselves by securing student opinion about institutional policies, facilities, services, faculty, and other student concerns for a standardized evaluation. Purposes: 1) Estimate attitudes & evaluations of students concerning faculty, institutional policies, facilities, & extra-curricular programs. 2) Evaluate usefulness of common student services. 3) Assess classroom atmosphere. 4) Appraise student development in non-academic areas. 5) Facilitate institutional research. 6) Supplement other evaluative methods by asking the consumer--the student.	Sophomores, seniors. Can also be used with: Freshmen Juniors Special groups, e.g., dorm residents, grad students, etc.	202 items		41 institutions by region: New England Midwest Great Lakes Plains Southwest Rocky Mountains Far West By type: Public U's. Public C's. Private U's. Private C's. 2-year C's.
			7 items, student descriptive data	check	
			12 items, student goals	1 - 4 rating (not important to essential)	
			12 items, educational experience	1 - 3 rating (not much progress to substantial)	
			Student evaluation of:		
			14 items, instructors	1 - 3 rating (minority to majority)	
			18 items, instructional policies	1 - 4 rating (disagree to no opinion)	
			9 items, instructional services	1 - 4 rating (little benefit to N/A)	
			10 10-item scales concerning sub-reports of college non-academic achievements.	yes/no	
			1 30-item check list of out-of-class activities	yes/no	

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Higher Education Measurement & Evaluation Kit (HEMEK) Pace-UCLA	Concern with a range of consequences of higher education. What personal & background characteristics, school & college experiences, & characteristics of institutional environment are associated with pertinent criterion measures of: Student participation in contemporary society & culture. Awareness of major changes taking place. Attitude toward such changes. Importance of the college experience.	Freshmen. Seniors. Alumni.	Mini-tests of from 5 to 15 items for measures of: 1) Student development, progress, attainment. 2) Educational process & context. 3) Student body characteristics. 4) Teacher/course evaluation.		90 institutions (1969), representative of eight types: Highly selective LA colleges General comprehensive U's (Somewhat similar to CUES typing of institutions)

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
HEMEK Evaluation Kit I	Nine scales related to behavioral definitions of objectives of liberal education: 1) Participation as an informed & responsible citizen. 2) Develop understanding of other people & their values. 3) Develop esthetic sensitivity. 4) Broaden acquaintance & appreciation of literature & interest in books. 5) Develop understanding & appreciation of sciences & technology. 6).Find meaning & direction in the conduct of life & a concern for values.	Students.	9 activities scales: 1) Community affairs, 9 items. 2) National & state politics, 10 items. 3) International & intercultural affairs, 8 items. 4) Art, 7 items. 5) Music, 9 items. 6) Literature, 8 items. 7) Drama, 7 items. 8) Religion, 9 items. 9) Science, 10 items.	Check activity.	7,500 upperclassmen in a (fall, 1969) cross-section of colleges & universities. Percentages by type of institution: 1. (GU) general comprehensive universities. 2. (SC & OU) state colleges & other less comprehensive universities. 3. (SU) highly selective universities. 4. (GLA) General liberal arts colleges. 5. (DLA) strongly denominational liberal arts colleges 6. (SLA) Highly selective liberal arts colleges. 7. (ES) colleges & universities having a major emphasis on engineering & sciences. 8. (TC) colleges having a major emphasis on teacher training.
	Means of assessing college's educational influence on development of students' opinions & values.		6 attitude scales 1) National status & world security, 6 items. 2) Freedom of expression, 5 items. 3) Role of women, 6 items. 4) Minority problems, 6 items 5) Societal viewpoints, 7 items. 6) Ecology, 6 items	1 - 4 rating (strongly agree to strongly disagree)	National sample (7,500). Cross-section of UCLA undergrads.

continued on page 2

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
HEMEK Evaluation Kit I *page 2*	Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. Each scale has two formats: 1) Rating the amount of progress. 2) Rating the amount of actual & preferable progress.		Progress scales:		National sample (7,500).
			1) Educational benefits, vocational, 4 items	1 - 4 rating (very much to very little)	
			2) Educational benefits, humanistic, 4 items	1 - 5 actual & preferred rating (very much to little or none)	
			3) Educational benefits, critical thinking, 5 items		
			4) Educational benefits, human relations, 6 items		

INSTRU-MENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
HEMEK Evaluation Kit II	Measures of educational processes and contexts: 1) The college environment. 2) Learning styles. 3) Campus experiences.		1. College Environment. A. An abbreviated 20-item version of CUES. Items selected are reflective of 5 CUES scales (Community, Practicality, Awareness, Propriety, Scholarship). B. The Professors. (Quality of teaching, and Faculty-Student relations). 11-item scale C. Campus Morale. 22-item scale grouped into 5 factors: 1) Freedom of expression. 2) Assimilation into campus life. 3) Group cohesiveness. 4) Commitment to intellectual goals. 5) Identification with social norms.	true/false	CUES, 1969 norm groups.
continued on page 2	Measurement of the degree of a student's academic involvement and intensity.		2. Learning Styles. 1) Academic, 10 items. 2) Experiential, 8 items. 3) Classroom Activities, 7 items	1 - 3 rating (very often to seldom)	Has not been pre-tested.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
HEMEK Evaluation Kit II *page 2*			4) Study habits, 10 items. 5) Variety of instructional and learning experiences. 14 items	yes/no and degree of satisfaction-- 1 - 5 rating (highly satisfied to highly dissatisfied)	
	Assessment of what sorts of experiences seemed influential in relation to perceived changes in personality development.	Seniors.	3. Campus Experiences.		Has not been pre-tested.
			A. 17 items for Involvement in Campus Activities, comprise 2 scales:		
			1) Campus Events scale, 9 items. 2) Campus Reforms scale, 8 items	Check activity.	
			B. 10-item Notable Experiences scale.		National sample (7,500).
			C. 6-item scale on Areas and Agents of Change During College.	1 - 3 rating (very much to none) Overall and agents.	
			D. General Satisfaction With College, 3 items.	Multiple choice.	National sample.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
HEMEK Evaluation Kit III	Measures of the student body. A. Academic Orientation. Will help plot academic orientation trends on particular campuses, leading to a college-prone index.		Set of questions about educational & family background.	Check appropriate column.	No comparative or normative data.
	B. Cosmopolitanism. To discover the range & variety of previous living experiences that students have.		Set of questions about geographic background.		
	C. Personal Traits and Dispositions. To measure the development of general experiences of maturing. The scales dealing with intellectual disposition are revisions & extensions of the item content in the national survey (CUES). Also reflect & designed to parallel corresponding sections of the OPI. Other partial borrowing: "Self-Acceptance Scale," by E. M. Berger. "Internal vs. External Control," by J. B. Rotter.		6 scales: 1) Intellectual Orientation, 15 items. 2) Critical Thinking Orientation, 13 items. 3) Scientific Orientation, 8 items. 4) Feelings About Self, 10 items. 5) Feelings About Other People, 10 items. 6) Feelings About the Future, 5 items.	1 - 4 rating (very much to not at all) Select from pair of statements and rate degree of sureness, 1 - 3.	
	D. Values and Priorities. From Kahn classification of "emphases" associated with different social & political ideologies & used here as basis for a measure of student values. Comparison of students' reported priorities with those they assign to society.		List of 30 words are grouped into 5 value emphases: 1) Transcendence. 2) Impulse. 3) Reason. 4) Conscience 5) God's Will.	Check positive or negative response to word.	
			11 items on societal priorities.	Ranking of self & majority (of people), 5 - 1 rating (high to low)	UCLA sample.

continued on page 2

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM. GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
HEMEK Evaluation Kit III *page 2*			12 items on educational priorities.	Ranking of self & majority (of people), 5 - 1 rating (high to low)	

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
HEMEK Evaluation Kit IV	Measures for teacher/course evaluation are designed to be of value to individual instructors as well as to the college. Many items taken from: Hildebrand, Experiment and Innovation, vol. 4, no. 1, May 1971. McKeachie, "Student Opinion of Teaching and Courses," AAUP Bulletin, vol. 55, W 69.		21 items, Teacher Evaluation Form. Organization, Evaluation, Feedback Index. 17 items, Interpersonal Orientation Index 27 items, Lecture Index 14 items, Discussion Index 11 items, Critical Thinking Index 15 items, Course Benefits Index	5 - 1 rating (very much to none) on actual & preferrable " "	No pre-test.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Descriptive Assessment of Learning Environments (DALE) Henry	Assessment of 5 internal levels of institutional functioning: 1. The person or personality level. 2. Interactional level. 3. Group level. 4. Organizational level. 5. Institutional level.	Students, faculty, administrators.		Multiple choice. 1 - 3 rating (important to not important). A 1, 2 ranking (most, to second most important).	Never used.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Davis Student Survey	Purpose is (1) an evaluation of a number of innovative peer-oriented student services, and (2) planning for an institutional research/evaluation function from a campus-wide perspective.	Undergraduate and graduate students.	4 short questionnaires. Each has the same biographical items (p. 2).		
			3 have different items on student problems (academic, personal, financial housing, etc.)p. 3.	2 dimensions of yes/no (need and assistance) 1 - 3 rating (not a problem to serious problem)	
			Each has same evaluational items of particular programs, pp. 6-7.		
			1) Student use & evaluation of auxiliary programs & individuals.		
			2) Student use & evaluation of 8 advising & counseling programs.		
			3) Student projected use of remedial &/or supplemental resources (e.g., audio-visual,etc.)		
			4) Student general evaluation of courses.		
			5) Student academic concerns (emphasis on grading).		
			6) Knowledge of/ use/evaluation of work/learn progs, of study abroad.		
			7) Satisfaction ratings of various aspects of campus life.		

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Evaluating University Teaching Hildebrand Wilson Four forms: 1. Student Description of Teachers--2 forms. 2. Colleague Description of Teachers--2 forms.	Two major aims: (1) to define and describe effective teaching, and (2) to find more valid, reliable, and effective means of incorporating the evaluation of teaching into advancement procedures. The purpose of both instruments is to: 1. Give the instructor a profile of his behavior as perceived by students or colleagues. 2. Provide information on the perceived effectiveness of his teaching practices.	Students (undergrads & grads), faculty colleagues Instructor for self-evaluation	Each Q includes the following types of item: 1) Basic information identifying instructor. 2) Description of teacher or teaching behavior. 3) Evaluation of general effectiveness of teacher (in comparison with other teachers). 4) Additional items to be added by instructor. 36 items comprise 5 teacher description scales in student form: 1) Analytic/synthetic approach. 2) Organization & clarity. 3) Instructor-group interaction. 4) Instructor-individual student interaction. 5) Dynamism/enthusiasm.	1 - 5 rating scales (not at all descriptive to very descriptive)	(Davis) 278 undergrads) '67 60 grads) 119 faculty) '67 1015 students in) '68 51 classes) 162 faculty Correlations between student ratings & overall effectiveness. Frequency distributions of best and worst teachers. Probability charts of best and worst teachers. Objectives of teaching favored by students. Other uses: UC-Davis Berkeley Santa Barbara Santa Cruz LA State College SF State College Wisc. State University Carson-Newman C. U. of Arizona Western Wash.State C. Carnegie-Mellon American Univ. Univ. of the Pacific

continued on page 2

INSTRU-MENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Evaluating University Teaching *page 2*			27 items comprise 5 scales in the colleague form: 1) Research activity and recognition. 2) Intellectual Breadth. 3) Participation in academic community. 4) Relation with students. 5) Concern for teaching.		

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Faculty Characteristics Questionnaire (Experimental Form I) Wilson, Gaff, Bavry	Developed to assist institutions to assess the diversity or homogeneity of faculty attitudes, activities, and other characteristics. Possible uses: 1) For systematic collection of data on faculty's values, attitudes, and activities. 2) For summarizing data needed for policy formulation. 3) For use in institutional research because of the 9 scales developed which include: 3 classroom teaching scales, 4 scales of attitudes toward students, 1 scale for attitudes toward educational change, and 1 scale for job satisfaction.	Faculty.	3 scales of faculty self-reported teaching practices: 1) Discursive. 2) Classroom participation. 3) Evaluation practices. 6 scales concerned with attitudes toward: 4) Regulation of personal behavior. 5) Personalization of student-faculty interaction. 6) Traditional extra-curricular activities. 7) Student motivation. 8) Current issues in educational change. 9) Job satisfaction.	1 - 5 rating (never to always). paired choice, (1) or (2). 1 - 4 rating (disagree strongly to agree strongly). Check list. Multiple choice. Open-ended.	1069 faculty members 6 diverse colleges & universities in 3 states 96% full-time 4% part-time 80% male 20% female 57% Ph.D.'s 43% w/o 26% in humanities 22% in natural science 30% in social science 21% in professional & applied fields

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Structured interviews and university records. (Analyses of Faculty Study, Robert Hind, 1971)	Theory predicts that the authority structure of an organization, and much of the behavior of its members, will be determined by the members' perception of the evaluation-reward system.	Stratified (by rank) random sample of 100 Stanford Univ. faculty in the School of Humanities and Sciences (1967-68).	Interview structured to obtain: 1) Tasks faculty actually did (univ. service & external service). 2) Reward potential for each. 3) Difference between existing task emphasis & preferred. 4) Influence of field & seniority. 5) Satisfaction with evaluation process. 6) Subjects' attitudes toward evaluator judgments.		Stratified (by rank) sample of 100 Stanford faculty. Percentage Tables: 1) Professional time spent on tasks (p. 272). 2) Desired changes in time allocation (p. 273). 3) Influence of tasks in determining rewards (p. 274). 4) Influence & direction of change (p. 276). 5) Effect of age on evaluation of teaching and research (p. 278). 6) Perceived influence of evaluators (students, administrators, department colleagues, etc.) (p. 280).

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Omnibus Personality Inventory (OPI) Heist and Yonge	Constructed to assess selected attitudes, values, and interests relevant in areas of normal ego functioning and intellectual activity. The dimensions were chosen for their relevance to academic activity and for their importance in understanding and differentiating among students in an educational context.	Students.	385 items, 14 scales: 1) Thinking Introversion (TI) 2) Thinking Orientation (TO) 3) Estheticism (Es) 4) Complexity (Co) 5) Autonomy (Au) 6) Religious Orientation (RO) 7) Social Extraversion (SE) 8) Impulse Expression (IE) 9) Personal Integration (PI) 10) Anxiety Level (AL) 11) Altruism (Am) 12) Practical Outlook (PO) 13) Masculinity-Femininity (MF) 14) Respondent Bias (RB) A one-digit summary of the results on 6 scales leads to the Intellectual Disposition Category (TI, TO, Co, Es, Au, RO).	true/false	37 institutions: public and private, colleges and universities (men's, women's, and coeducational). Technology institutes. Art institutes. Junior Colleges. 3540 men) freshmen 3743 women) Scale correlations with: AVL Study of Values. SVIB (men). Guilford-Zimmerman Temperament Survey. Myers-Briggs Type Inventory. Kuder Preference Record (Form C). CPI. Miller Analogies Test and Faculty Ratings. Certain Experimental Measures & SAT. Activities Index. Edwards Personal Preference Schedule. MMPI.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Course Comments Questionnaire (CCQ-UWGB)	Questionnaire used to encourage student contributions to instructional improvement.	Students.	35 items representing 7 scales (5 items each). 1. Global rating (overall summary judgment of course). 2. Responsiveness (teacher-student rapport). 3. Difficulty. 4. Organization. 5. General cognitive development. 6. Specific cognitive development. 7. Relevance.	1 - 5 rating (desirable to poor/inadequate)	4489 students from 189 different courses. Percentage distributions on combined responses for each item in each scale.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
The Experience of College Questionnaire, by Project on Student Development in Small Colleges (ECQ)	Assessment of courses which are being pursued at the time of taking questionnaire.	Students.	46 items concerning: factual statements about course and instructors; statements about students' feelings and satisfactions, perceptions of peers, attitudes.	Multiple choice.	Don't know.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Criteria of Student Success Johnston College, University of Redlands, California.	Rating scale of faculty opinions regarding success criteria. Used to rate graduating seniors.	Teaching faculty.	27 items, including cognitive and affective criteria statements.	1 - 4 rating (highly important to not important)	30 faculty members (Johnston College). Items analyzed by: mean scales, number of times marked "most important", number of times marked "least important", rank order. Inter-correlations of faculty agreement with one another. Degree of importance faculty place on list of criteria.

INSTRUMENT	DESCRIPTION	RESPONDENT	SCALES/ITEMS	RESPONSE SET	NORM GROUP/ CORRELATIONS
Illinois CEQ-Aleamoni	Instrument developed to collect student attitudes toward a course. Purpose is to enable faculty to collect evaluative information about their teaching.	Students	2 forms: Form 72--25 items Form 66--50 items 6 scales: 1) General course Attitude 2) Method of Instruction 3) Course content 4) Interest and Attention 5) Instructor 6) Specific Items (of interest to instructor, dept. etc.)	1-4 rating (Strongly agree to Strongly disagree)	Raw scores & normal approximation mean intervals for CEQ items: 2784 sections (U.of Ill.) 5346 sections (C. & U's. throughout U.S.) for CEQ subscales by rank: 322 Grad. T.A's (U.of Ill.) 228 Instructors " 498 Asst.Prof. " 177 Assoc.Prof. " 194 Profs. " 396 Grad. T.A's (C.& U's.) 578 Instructors " 717 Asst.Profs. " 362 Assoc.Profs. " 508 Profs. for CEQ subscales by course levels: 1185 Fresh.courses (U.of In. 442 Soph.courses " 238 Jr.& Sr.courses " 109 Grad.courses " 2035 Fresh.courses (C.& U's. 860 Soph.courses " 452 Jr.& Sr.courses " 220 Grad.courses " for CEQ subscales totals: 2784 Sections (U.of Ill.) 5346 Sections (C. & U's. throughout U.S.)

I. AUDIENCE INNOVATIONS

PART II: THE INNOVATIONS AND THEIR EVALUATION

GENERAL EVALUATION STRATEGIES FOR AUDIENCE INNOVATIONS

1. Measurement of cognitive gains by pre-post tests or game simulation.
2. Measurement of changes in student attitude by pre-posts, interview, or role playing.
3. Interviews with students, faculty, and administrators both involved with the innovation and university wide.
4. Use of student time schedules. Percent of time in counseling, compensatory programs, or classrooms.
5. Case studies including followups.
6. Comparison of how students do in the program courses compared to courses taken in the school at large.
7. Use of indicators of program success such as drop out rate and matriculation rate, both in the program and the college at large.
8. Visits by external and internal evaluators.

I. Audience

A. Low Achievers--Cross's "New Students"

1. Counseling services--attitude reorientation.
2. Remedial services.
3. Orientation programs.
4. "Learning lab" programs.
5. Vocational programs (as suggested by Cross)
6. Financial aids.
7. Tutoring programs--peer or otherwise.
8. "Guaranteed success" programs--starting one or two levels below tested ability (see Cross, 1972, p. 158).
9. Feedback on performance-reward system.
10. Light course loads--small classes.
11. Non-punitive grading.
12. Use of materials from ethnic cultures where appropriate.
13. Teacher-counselor-tutor training in problems of low achievers.
14. Reward system for evaluation of teachers.
15. Administrative attitude about program.
16. Budget allocations.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Have attitudes towards written material changed? CHECK: reading habits before, during, and after the program

2. Is leisure time spent in more intellectual pursuits? CHECK: college clubs or organizations joined

INNOVATION: Low Achievers; Cross's "New Students"

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Federal City Nairobi College Central YMCA Community College San Jose City College	X				Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Individual Personal Development Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Public Service Social Egalitarianism Innovation Accountability/Efficiency IFI Human Diversity Concern for Improvement of Society Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation
					Davis Student Survey. Sections on student use/evaluation of auxiliary programs or individuals. Student use/evaluation of counseling and advising programs. Academic concerns. Project use, remedial resources. Knowledge/use/evaluation of work-learn programs.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Low Achievers; Cross's "New Students," p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-II Section A. Section on campu morale for specific areas of assimilation into campus life, group cohesiveness, and identification with social norms. HEMEK-II Section B. Learning styles, especially study habits. HEMEK-II Section C. Influential experiences, especially section on areas and agents of change, and general satisfaction. HEMEK-III Section A. 6 scales relate to personal traits and dispositions, especially scales on: Feelings about Self, Feelings about Other People, Feelings about Future. SIR-ETS. Student assessment of college courses and instruction. Faculty ratings of student competenci Nonacademic interests and activities.

I. Audience

B. Ethnic minority students.

1. Remedial, compensatory programs.
2. Use of ethnic materials where appropriate, amount of use, type of use.
3. Counseling services--ethnic counselors, training, approach.
4. Orientation programs--special.
5. Financial aids.
6. Tutoring programs--peer or otherwise.
7. "Guaranteed success" programs. (See Cross, 1972, p. 158)
8. Feedback-reward system.
9. Course loads--size of classes.
10. Non-punitive grading.
11. Teacher-counselor-tutor training in problems of ethnic and minority students.
12. Ethnic community work programs.

14. Ethnic cultural activities.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does the college experience affect the minority students self-image? CHECK: cultural organizations joined or quit

2. Do the white and minority students mix on campus or off campus? CHECK: availabilty of seperate minority facilities, patterns of student locomotion

3. Do the minority students join the main flow of campus life? CHECK: course enrollments, clubs joined, offices held

INNOVATION: Ethnic Minority Students

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
DQU--Davis Federal City Nairobi Navajo Community College Staten Island Community College Malcolm X Community College Pepperdine UWW--Flaming Rainbow Indian Cluster Program	X				Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Individual Personal Development Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Public Service Social Egalitarianism Democratic Governance Community Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Human Diversity Concern for Improvement of Society Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit ----------------------------------- Davis Student Survey. Sections on student use/evaluation of auxiliary programs or individuals. Student use/evaluation of advising and counseling programs.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Ethnic Minority Students, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					Projected use of remedial and/or supplemental resources. Academic concerns. Satisfaction ratings of various aspects of campus life. HEMEK-II Section B. Student learning styles: Academic, Experiential, Classroom Activities, Study Habits, and Variety of Instructional and Learning Experiences. Evaluating University Teaching--Wilson. Section on description of teacher or teaching. 5 scales. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation with special emphasis on Interpersonal Orientatation Index and Course Benefits Index. Faculty ratings of student competencies.

I. Audience

C. Working-class students, first college generation.

1. Remedial programs.
2. Counseling services.
3. Financial aids.
4. Special orientations, programs.
5. Feedback--reward system.
6. Reduced course loads--size of classes--at least in orientation period (first semester)
7. Non-punitive grading.
8. Teacher-counselor-tutor training in problems of first generation college students.
9. Vocational programs and placement services, where appropriate.
10. Ethnic programs where appropriate.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is there a family clash between the college student and the rest of the family? CHECK: interview with family, the availability of family counseling

2. Are these students visibly different from the rest of the campus and, if so, does it affect their output? CHECK: clothing, dormitory rooms, cars

3. Do a greater percentage of these students have to work and does this affect their scholastic output and ability to take part in college activities? CHECK: roster of working students against activity list and GPA

INNOVATION: Working-Class Students, First College Generation

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRATEGIES	COUN. STRATEGIES	T/S/V STRATEGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Federal City Alice Lloyd College (Heiss) Nairobi College Barat Central YMCA Community College Community College of Vermont San Jose City College Sterling College	X				Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Individual Personal Development Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Public Service Social Egalitarianism Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Human Diversity Concern for Improvement of Society Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation ------------------------------ Davis Student Survey. Sections on: student use/evaluation of advising and counseling programs, student academic concerns, knowledge/use/evaluation of work-learn programs. HEMEK-II Section A. Campus morale. Scales: Assimilation into Campus Life, Group Cohesiveness, Commitment to Intellectual Goals, Identification with Social Norms.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Working-Class Students, First College Generation, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-II Section B. Measurement of degree of students' academic involvement and intensity. 5 learning styles academic, experiential, classroom activities, study habits, and instructional and learning experiences. HEMEK-II Section C. Campus experienc Sections on events and areas and agent of change. HEMEK-III Section C. Personal traits and dispositions. 6 scales. HEMEK-III Section D. The Kahn classification of value emphases. OPI. Pre-post testing, using 14 scales. ISS-Act. Student evaluation of instructors, institutional policies and practices. HEMEK-I Section C. Student self-estimate of progress toward attainment of educational objectives, vocational, humanistic, critical thinking, human relations. Faculty ratings of student competencies.

I. Audience

D. Adults returning to school after several or many years.

1. Child care services, facilities.
2. Teaching quality in extension programs.
3. Flexible times.
4. Reward system for faculty--and evaluation system.
5. Opportunity for extension administrators to recruit and retain talent from outside the university.
6. Availability of financial aid.
7. Recognition of central administrators and budget offices of importance of extension offerings.
8. External degree--qualification for degree through examination, reading, correspondence courses, relevant work experience--flexible delivery.
9. Use of educational media.
10. Counseling services
11. Teacher-counselor training in adult education.
12. Testing and grading strategies.
13. Library facilities.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does the return to school upset the family? CHECK: interview family, availability of family counseling, divorce rate of students

2. Are the adult students integrated into the campus? CHECK: participation in school functions, patterns of locomotion - all adult, mixed

3. Is further schooling affecting their job or other relationships? CHECK: interview friends, family, fellow workers,boss

INNOVATION: Returning Adults (After Several or More Years)

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
San Jose City College Community Colleges Extenal Degree Programs	X				Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Individual Personal Development Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Public Service Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Human Diversity Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation OPI. Pre-post testing using 14 scales. CUES To define intellectual-social-cultural atmosphere on 5 scales: Practicality, community, awareness, propriety, scholarship. HEMEK-II Section A. Campus morale with special emphasis on factor: Assimilation into campus life, commitment to intellectual goals, and identification with social norms.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Returning Adults (After Several or More Years), p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-II Section B. Measures of student's academic involvement and intensity--special emphasis on study habits and variety of instructional and learning experiences.
					HEMEK-II Section C. Influential campus experiences: campus events, notable experiences, areas and agents of change and general satisfaction.
					ISS-ACT. Student assessment of educational experience, instructors institutional polices and practices. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation with special emphasis on Course Benefits Index.
					Faculty ratings of student competencies.

I. Audience

E. Adult students returning for technical, vocational update; also company programs for labor.

1. Quality of teaching.
2. Flexible times; work credit; time off.
3. Child-care facilities, if necessary.
4. Reward system and evaluation system for faculty.
5. Use of educational media.
6. Testing and grading strategies.
7. Balance of instruction and practice.
8. Budget
9. Company emphasis on training, reward system.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does additional schooling interfere with work or does the company sanction further training? CHECK: time off for study, financial assistance, incentives to study

2. Does the combination of work and school interfere with family life? CHECK: interview family, availability of family counseling, divorce rate

3. Are the students only updating skills or are they taking different courses and participating in the life of the school? CHECK: course rolls, organization member lists

INNOVATION: Returning Adults for Technical/Vocational Update

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Community Colleges UWW	X				Faculty, administration, and student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Public Service Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Human Diversity Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation -- HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation on 5 indices: Interpersonal Orientatic Lecture, Discussion, Critical Thinking and Course Benefits. HEMEK-III, Section D. Section on societal priorities and on self-educational priorities. HEMEK-II, Section B. Learning styles: academic, experiential, study habits, and variety of instructional and learning experiences.

continued on page 2

INNOVATION: Returning Adults for Technical/Vocational Update, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Community Colleges UWW					HEMEK-II, Section C. Influential educational experiences: notable areas, and agents of change. Illinois CEQ. Student attitudes toward course: method of instruction, content, interest and attention, instructor. SIR-ETS. Section on evaluation of class texts. Course Comments Questionnaire (UWGB). Section on relevance. Faculty ratings of student competencie

I. Audience

F. Professionals--supplemental and "continuing" training.

1. Breadth of offerings--theory, application, etc.
2. Flexible times.
3. Time off, other rewards.
4. Child-care services, if necessary.
5. Quality of teaching.
6. Availability of financial aids, if necessary.
7. Flexible requirements--qualification for degree through examination, reading, correspondence courses, relevant work experience--flexible delivery.
8. Use of educational media
9. Testing and grading strategies.
10. Library facilities.
11. Reward system for faculty and evaluation system.
12. Tie-in of instruction to practice.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Same as I. E.

INNOVATION: Professionals for Supplementary and Continuing Training

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
External Degree Programs Various Professional Schools	X				Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation Concern for Advancing Knowledge
					HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of attainments of education objectives: Vocational, humanistic, critical thinking, human relations.
					Course Comments Q--UWGB. Summary judgments of course. Faculty-student rapport, difficulty, organization, general cognitive development, specific cognitive development, relevance.
					Faculty rating of student competencies

II. CONTENT INNOVATIONS

GENERAL EVALUATION STRATEGIES FOR CONTENT INNOVATIONS

1. Interviews with students, faculty, and administrators both involved with the innovation and university wide.
2. Comparison of how students in the new program do compared to the students not enrolled in the new program.
3. Comparison of students who take some courses in the new content area with students who major in the new area.
4. Compare, where possible, standard courses with courses in the new area. For example, introductory biology as taught in the biology department vs. man and his environment in environmental studies.
5. Do a needs/wants assessment to see if the new program is really needed and wanted. Could it be handled by a few new courses?
6. Student case studies including followups. Do students who majored in a new program have trouble getting into graduate school or getting a job?
7. Use of indicators of program success such as drop out rate and matriculation rate, both in the new content area and the college at large.
8. Visits by external and internal evaluators.

II. Content

A. Ethnic studies.

1. Difficulty, challenge of the course and curriculum.
2. Development of more traditional scholarship skills.
3. Development of positive attitudes towards ethnic culture.
4. Quality of teaching.
5. Quality of community work experience, if included in program.
6. Counseling services, advisors.
7. Breadth of curriculum offerings.
8. Attitude of college administration to program.
9. Budget allocations.
10. Student participation in program.
11. Amount of supplementation with guest speakers, educational media, student presentations.
12. Types of assignments.
13. Physical facilities.
14. Appreciation of intellectual, cultural, economic, and social contributions of ethnic groups.
15. Required readings.
16. Conferences, vists during office hours.
17. Self-study.
18. Research projects, papers.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See audience innovations I.B. 1-3

2. Is there any effect in the minority community as a result of the college program? CHECK: new organizations started, community projects

3. Do whites take an interest in the program? CHECK: class enrollments

INNOVATION: Ethnic Studies

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too Numerous See Heiss pg. 86,87	X	X			Faculty, administration, students IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Individual Personal Development Humanism/Altruism Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Public Service Social Egalitarianism Freedom Democratic Governance Community Off-Campus Learning Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Improvement of Society Concern for Innovation -------------------- ISS-ACT. Measures on student goals and educational experience -------------------- HEMEK-III Section C. Personal traits and dispositions: Feelings about self, other people, and the future. -------------------- *continued on p. 2*

INNOVATION: Ethnic Studies, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					SIR-ETS. Student assessment of courses and instruction.
					HEMEK-IV Teacher/course evaluation.
					ISS-ACT. Student evaluation of instructors, institutional policies and services.
					HEMEK-II Section A. Quality of teaching and faculty--student relations. Scale. Campus morale. Scale.
					HEMEK-II Section B. Learning styles
					HEMEK-II Section C. Campus Experiences: (a) Involvement in campus activities (Events and reforms), (b) areas and agents of change, (c) general satisfaction.
					HEMEK-I Section B. Assessing educational influence on development of student's opinions and values. 6 scales.

continued on p. 3

INNOVATION: Ethnic Studies, p. 3

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of progress, award attainment of objectives: vocational, humanistic, critical thinking, human relations. Davis Student Survey--Items concerning: General evaluation of courses, student academic concerns, satisfaction ratings of campus life. Faculty ratings of compentencies.

INNOVATION: "New" Culture Programs

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
DQU at Davis Experimental and Bilingual Institute, Inc. UWW--Flaming Rainbow Indian Cluster Program Navajo Community College	X	X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation IFI Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum Concern for Innovation HEMEK-II Part C. Campus experiences 1. Involvement in campus events. 3. Notable experiences. ISS-ACT. Scales for student evaluation of institutional facilities and extracurricular programs, ie., report of nonacademic achievements, out of class activities. OPI-IDC (Composite scores on scales, TI, TO CO, ES, AU RO). HEMEK-I Section A. Five (out of 9) activities scales.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: "New" Culture Programs, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					3) International and intercultural affairs 4) Art 5) Music 6) Literature 7) Drama ------------------------------------ HEMEK-I Section C. Progress award. Attainment of broad objectives and benefits. Scale 2--Humanistic.

II. Content

B. Environmental studies.

1. Breadth of curriculum offerings requirements. Often too broad?
2. Appreciation of complexity, interdisciplinary character of field.
3. Areas of specialization offered.
4. Field work, research projects.
5. Administrative attitudes toward program.
6. Mix of theory and practical issues.
7. Budget allocations.
8. Supplementation of earning experience with guest lectures, educational media, student presentations.
9. Required reading.
10. Library facilities.
11. Teacher preparation for field.
12. Self-study.
13. Availability of program advisory.
14. Original goals as stated and actual goals.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does the students interest in the environment carry over into outside activities? CHECK· organizations joined, public work done

INNOVATION: Environmental Studies

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
University of Wisconsin Green Bay Cornell Frostburg College Michigan UCR Rutgers Huxley College, Western Washington St. Williams Kresge UCSC Lee's Junior College Stanford Georgia Berkeley		X			Faculty, administration, students IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Humanism/Altruism Research Public Service Social Criticism/Activism IFI Concern for Improvement of Society Concern for Advancing Knowledge (AK) ------------------------------------ HEMEK-IV Teacher/course evaluation: Teacher evaluation. Index, course Benefits Index. SIR-ETS Evaluation of course, exams, STU-FAC evaluation, Teaching and techniques. Also, section of class sets. Illinois CEQ-Student attitudes Award courses: Method of instruction, course content, interest and attention, instructor.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Environmental Studies, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					Course Comments Q, UWGB section on course relevance. HEMEK-I Section B. Education influence on students opinions and values. 6 scales. HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of progress in obtaining objectives. 4 scales. HEMEK-II Section C. Influential experiences on development changes.

II. Content

C. Women's Studies

1. Goals, consensus.
2. Teacher preparation.
3. Supplementation of lectures with guest speakers, educational media and student presentations.
4. Required reading.
5. Library resources.
6. Use of library.
7. Research projects, papers.
8. Budget allocations.
9. Attitudes of administration.
10. Use of office hours, consultation opportunities.
11. Self-study.
12. Original goals as stated.
13. Reward structure for teachers.
14. Awareness, learning of students.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How does the course affect outside relationships? CHECK: spouses, friends, co-workers, divorce rate

2. Are males interested? Are they allowed to participate? CHECK: course enrollments, sampling male attitudes

3. Does the program overflow into everyday life? CHECK: organizations joined

4. Follow ups to see if women who took program react differently in life. CHECK: keep maiden name when married, get non-stereotyped job at equal pay

INNOVATION: Women's Studies

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT- EGIES	COUN. STRAT- EGIES	T/S/V STRAT- EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
See Heiss pg. 95 Barat College Seton Hall Women's History Research Center	X	X			Studentbody measures isolating women's scores: HEMEK-III Part C. Which measures development of general experiences of maturing. HEMEK-I. Which assesses educational influence on development of student's attitudes, opinions and values. (6 scales) OPI--IDC (TI, TO, CO, ES, AU, RO) --- Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Social Criticism/Activism Social Egalitarianism Freedom Meeting Local Needs Innovation Community Individual Personal Development IFI Concern for Improvement of Society Human Diversity Freedom Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Women's Studies, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRATEGIES	COUN. STRATEGIES	T/S/V STRATEGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					Compare students' goal priorities with course priorities: Course Comments Q (UWGB)--7 scales. HEMEK-IV. Course Benefits Index. (15-Items)

II. Content

D. Community Programs, Community Work

1. Supplements through tie-ins to theory and research.
2. Administrative attitudes to community work, programs--hostility?
3. Budget allocations.
4. Reporting of work, accountability process.
5. Type of work performed.
6. Formal write-ups.
7. Attitudes of community to students.
8. Evaluation process--feedback mechanism.
9. Attitudes and levels of satisfaction of program administrators on campus and in community.
10. Communication between program administration on campus and in community.
11. Credit, testing and grading.
12. Teacher preparation and background.
13. Self-study.
14. Required readings.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Do any students continue to work in the community at the end of the program? CHECK: student survey, poll community leaders

2. How successful was the program? CHECK: does the community still want the program, do students continue to participate in community life

INNOVATION: Community Programs, Community Work

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Antioch Alice Lloyd College Wright Institute Minnesota Notre Dame Suny Albany U Mass at Columbia Point Harvard Maria College Northeastern (Heiss)		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Off-Campus Learning Meeting Local Needs Humanism/Altruism IFI Concern for Improvement of Society Meeting Local Needs
					Davis Student Survey. Section on Knowledge/use/evaluation of work-learn programs.
Community College of Vermont Kuskokwim Community College University of New Hampshire					HEMEK-I Section A. Activity scale 1-Community affairs.
					HEMEK-I Section B. Attitude scales: Societal viewpoints ecology, Minority problems, Education benefits scales, Human relations.
					Competency based measures, ie., Ottawa University Observation form, specially prepared for rating of students.

II. Content

E. Urban Studies

1. Breadth of curriculum offerings, requirements.
2. Appreciation of complexity, interdisciplinary, character of field.
3. Work in urban social, governmental agencies, if included in program.
4. Research projects, papers.
5. Teacher preparation, reward structure.
6. Administrative attitudes toward program.
7. Budget allocations.
8. Supplementation of regular lectures and work through guest speakers, educational media and student presentations.
9. Goals as stated and actually.
10. Self-study.
11. Contact between urban community administrators and department professors.
12. Attitudes, sophistication of students.
13. Library resources, use.
14. Mix of theory, practical issues, experience.
15. Required reading.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Are the facilities of an urban community available and are they used?

CHECK: course syllabi

INNOVATION: Urban Studies

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too numerous to mention See Heiss Pg. 91		X			Faculty, administration, students IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Meeting Local Needs Public Service Social Criticism/Activism Off-Campus Learning IFI Concern for Improvement of Society Meeting Local Needs
					ISS-ACT Section on student goals, and Section or degree of progress made in attaining goals.
					HEMEK-III Section C. Student feelings about the future. 5 items.
					HEMEK-III Section D. Measure of student values. Students report priorities for self and for society. 11 items.
					HEMEK-I Section assessing educational influence on development of students' opinions and values--scales on,

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Urban Studies, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					minority problems, societal view points, and ecology.
					Course Comments Q-UWGB--student evaluation of course relevance.
					Illinois CEQ-student attitudes award courses. 6 scales.
					Davis Student Survey--Section on knowledge/use/evaluation of work-learn programs.
					SIR-ETS. Student assessment of college courses and instruction.
					HEMEK-IV. Course Benefits Index. 15 items.

II. Content

F. "Contemporary Political and Social Issues" and "Unified Sciences" Programs. Issue-oriented Interdisciplinary Programs.

1. Breadth of curriculum offerings, requirements.
2. Centrality, prominence or sophistication of issues chosen.
3. Contributions, final projects of students.
4. Appreciation of complexity, interdisciplinary character of issues.
5. Faculty preparation, research, reward structure.
6. Administrative attitudes toward program, budget allocations.
7. Supplementation of lectures, independent research through guest speakers, educational media and presentations by other students.
8. Goals as stated and actually and results
9. Monitoring and feedback in individual, group study.
10. Availability and use of library resources, outside expertise, campus resources.
11. Required reading assigned.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. If the program does not have a seperate faculty, but draws from other departments, does this cause any special problems? CHECK: faculty with joint appointments, department chairman

Issue-oriented Interdisciplinary Programs:
"Contemporary Political and Social Issues"
INNOVATION: "Unified Sciences" "Traditional Students"

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
College of Human Resources and Education at University of W. Virginia Wallace School of Community Service and Public Affairs at University of Oregon Environmental Design Berkeley College of Human Development Penn State College of Human Ecology Cornell Institute for Human Services Boston College Collegiate System Suny Buffalo Division of General and Interdisciplinary Studies at University of Washington Division for Experimental and Multi-disciplinary Programs University of Hawaii		X			Faculty, administration, students IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Social Criticism/Activism Public Service Community Freedom IFI Concern for Improvement of Society Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum Freedom ------------------------------ Student assessment of course and instruction. 1) SIR-ETS. Measures F-S interaction, teaching and techniques. 2) HEMEK-IV. Lecture Index Discussion Index, Critical Thinking Index, Course Benefits Index. 3) Illinois Course Evaluation Q, sections which measure course content and interest and attention. 4) Course Comments Questionnaire (UWGB). ------------------------------

continued on p. 2

Issue-oriented Interdisciplinary Programs:
"Contemporary Political and Social Issues"
INNOVATION: "Unified Sciences" "Traditional Students", P. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					Measure of education influence on development of students opinions and values. HEMEK-I. 6 scales. Student self-assessment of progress toward attainment of objectives HEMEK-I. 4 scales. --------------------------------------- Faculty rating of student competency. Johnston College Graduate School of Business rating sheets for compentencies.

II. Content

G. Other Interdisciplinary (such as "Peace Studies," "Non-Western Studies," "Futuristics," etc.)

1. Breadth of curriculum offerings, requirements.
2. Appreciation of complexity, interdisciplinary character of field.
3. Work in course-related agency or organization, if included in program.
4. Research projects, papers.
5. Teacher preparation, reward structure.
6. Administrative attitudes toward program budget allocations.
7. Supplementation of regular lectures and work through guest speakers, educational media and student presentations.
8. Goals as stated and actually and results. Discrepancy
9. Self-study.
10. Attitudes, sophistication of students.
11. Library resources, use.
12. Mix of theory, practical issues, experience.
13. Required reading in courses.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See II.F.1

2. What is the duration of these programs before they are phased out?

CHECK: other campuses, evaluation design must take the Hawthorne effect into account

Interdisciplinary Studies:

INNOVATION: Peace Studies, Non-Western Studies, Futuristics

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too Numerous to Mention (See Heiss pg. 90)		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Humanism/Altruism Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness Research Social Criticism/Activism Freedom Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Improvement of Society Freedom Concern for Innovation
					SIR-ETS. Student assessment of college courses and instruction; student assessment of class texts.
					Illinois CEQ. Student attitudes toward course: Method of instruction, course content, interest and attention and instructor.
					HEMEK-I Section A. Student activities scales: National and State politics, International and Intercultural affairs, Art, Music, and Drama.

continued on p. 2

Interdisciplinary Studies:
INNOVATION: ~~Peace Studies, Non Western Studies, Fu~~turistics, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-I Section B. Student attitudes about social issues on national statues and world security, freedom of expression, societial viewpoints scales. HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of attainment of objectives: humanistic, critical thinking. Faculty ratings of student competencies Johnston Colleges Graduate School of Business ratings. HEMEK-III Section A. Academic orientation trends--College prove index. HEMEK-III Section B. Cosmopolitanism range and variety of living experiences.

III. TEACHING AND COUNSELLING INNOVATIONS

GENERAL EVALUATION STRATEGIES FOR TEACHING AND COUNSELING INNOVATIONS

1. Interviews with students, faculty, and administrators both involved with the innovation and university wide.
2. Compare, when possible, a standardly taught course with a course taugh using a new method. For example, a lecture course in psychology with a contract course in psychology.
3. Do a needs/wants assessment to see if the new methods are really needed and wanted.
4. How has the innovation affected cost-effectiveness? Are the faculty seeing more or less students? Are more faculty needed?
5. Compare how students using the innovation do as compared to those not using it.
6. Use of indicators of program success such as drop out rate and matriculation rate. Also, see if students continue to use the innovation or only use it once.
7. Visits by external and internal evaluators.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

A. Contract Learning. "To emphasize the mutual responsibilities between teaching institutions and students, some colleges have substituted a learning contract for a prescribed program. On this plan the student, with faculty guidance, constructs his own four-year program. If his plan is approved by a faculty committee, a contract is drawn between the student and the school, binding the student to fulfill the program of study and the school to provide the courses and to award the degree. The contract may be amended by mutual agreement." (Heiss, p. 102.) Contract learning is also, and perhaps more frequently, extended to individual courses.

1. Broken contracts--what distinguishes them?
2. Content of contracts.
3. Degree of motivation of students, teachers, to satisfy contracts.
4. Does the contract method lead to depersonalized, bureaucratic or strictly utilitarian ethos in class?
5. Types of contracts accepted, rejected.
6. Consultation time before setting contract. How is it used?
7. Student learning satisfaction, teacher satisfaction.
8. Contract amendment process.
9. Composition of contract advising committee.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How much discrepancy is there between the contract and the final product? CHECK: contract and work done in fulfillment

2. Are students using other resources besides the mentor? CHECK: contract

3. Are there problems getting into graduate school because of translation of credit problems? CHECK: graduate school admissions

INNOVATION: Contract Learning

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Univ. of Alabama, New College Johnston College--Redlands Evergreen State New College, Sarasota Ottawa College Simpson College Whittier Justin Morrill Morgan State College Empire State Grand Valley State, College IV (in addition to or in place of modules)		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Individual Personal Development Democratic Governance Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Democratic Governance Concern for Innovation
					OPI--Pre-testing for Intellectual Disposition Category.
					HEMEK-I Section B. Educational influence on development of students opinions and values. 6 scales.
					HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward obtaining education objectives. 4 scales.
					HEMEK-III Section A. For measures of the studentbody: Academic

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Contract Learning, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					orientation, cosmopolitanism, and Personal traits and dispositions. SIR-ETS. Student assessment of course to include: Exams, student-teacher interaction, teaching and techniques.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

B. "Systems" or "Behavioral Objectives" Approach. The teacher operates under preconceived concepts of educational goals for the course. These can and often do include behavioral and attitudinal changes as well as subject mastery. The teacher deliberately designs rewards and sanctions to encourage achievement of established objectives.

1. Kinds of behavioral objectives established.
2. System of rewards and sanctions.
3. Levels of student cooperation, enthusiasm.
4. Explanation of behavioral objectives to class?
5. Maintainance of students' "academic freedom"?
6. Discrepancy between behavioral objectives set and final results.
7. Periodic reconsideration of behavioral objectives and methods?
8. Student feedback collected? If so, how used?
9. Measure of acceptance of possibly contrasting objectives of liberal education .

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How much discepancy is there between the objectives and the outcomes? CHECK: objectives and outcomes

2. How are the objectives decided, by the teacher student, both? CHECK: beginning classes

3. Are different ways offered to meet the objectives? CHECK: class procedures

4. Are the objectives evaluated, by whom? CHECK: administration, other faculty, students

INNOVATION: Programmed Courses

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Beloit Michigan State Florida Atlantic University UCI UCB SUNY Albany Duke Palm Beach Junior College California State, Sacramento Delta College		X			Faculty, administration, and student IFI and IGI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Individual Personal Development Humanism/Altruism Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness Intellectual Orientation Social Criticism/Activism Freedom Democratic Governance Innovation Community IFI Freedom Concern for Improvement of Society Concern for Undergraduate Learning Democratic Governance Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit ------------------------------------ HEMEK-I, Section A. 9 activities scales related to behavioral objectives of a liberal education. HEMEK-I, Section B. Educational influence on development of students' opinions and values. 6 attitude scale

continued on page 2

INNOVATION: Programmed Courses, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. Evaluation of University Teaching (Wilson). Evaluation of teacher in comparison with other teachers. Course Comments Questionnaire (UWGB). Summary judgement of course.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

C. Independent Study. Independent study can be offered as a strictly regulated option to only the best students at a school, as an option to all students, or even as a requirement of all students. It may be restricted as a substitute for one course or it may replace all courses for as much as an entire year or more. The most radical example was the now-defunct Antioch First Year Program, premised on the belief that the Antioch community was a rich educational resource which students, given the time and limited guidance, would use best for their own development. To provide the time, all course requirements were eliminated, grades and attendance requirements were abolished, and the students were urged to fashion a curriculum of their own.

1. Achievements, final reports.
2. Amount and quality of faculty guidance offered, sought.
3. Evaluation process.
4. Preliminary requirements, discussion.
5. Progress reporting procedure.
6. Changes in attitude towards subject studied.
7. Types of strategies designed for study, depth of investigation.
8. Faculty, student, attitudes toward independent study. (Seen as "mick"?).
9. Student use of campus resources. Preliminary training to do so?
10. Measure of learning.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does the student continue to be interested in what was independently studied? CHECK: selection of courses

2. How does one year of independent study compare to one year of standard course work? CHECK: would involve complex evaluation design

3. How are the study topics chosen? CHECK: student initiative, faculty

INNOVATION: Independent Study

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too Numerous to Mention		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Research Freedom Democratic Governance Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Innovation Democratic Governance --- HEMEK-I Section A. Student activities, scales related to behavioral objectives of liberal arts education. 9 scales. --- HEMEK-I Section B. Educational influence on development of students' opinions and values. 6 attitude scales. --- HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimate of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. --- *continued on p. 2*

INNOVATION: Independent Study, p. 2

INSTIIUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					OPI. Pre-post testing. 14 scales and IDC.
					Course Comment Q--(UWGB). Summary judgment of course, teacher-student rapport, difficulty, general and specific cognitive development, and relevance.
					Faculty rating of student competency.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

D. "Team Teaching" in Interdisciplinary Courses.

1. Coordination of materials taught. Exploration of relationships, references to lectures of other lecturer(s).
2. Discussion groups--interaction.
3. Projects, test scores.
4. Ability of teachers to work together, course planning sections held?
5. Feedback on lectures from students. Collected? Used?
6. Points of contradiction or difference in approach made explicit.
7. Agreement on grading standards, consensus on goals between faculty.
8. Student attendance, enthusiasm (reflected in projects, library use, participation).
9. Supplements to regular lectures through guest lecturers, educational media, and student presentations (apparently common in team-taught courses).
10. Administration attitudes, budget allocation.
11. Structural, content change from year to year. History of course.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is there a special faculty problem of joint appointments or work load? CHECK: faculty, faculty chairman

2. Is one professor carrying the load of others? CHECK: process evaluation, time series, student questionnaire

3. Is it cost effective? CHECK: enrollment figures, opportunity costs

INNOVATION: Team Teaching in Interdisciplinary Courses

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRATEGIES	COUN. STRATEGIES	T/S/V STRATEGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Drew University Bowdoin Baldwin Wallace Mt. Holyoke Tufts Wittenberg Cornell Carroll College San Jose State		X			Faculty, administration, and student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Freedom Innovation Accountability/Efficiency IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Freedom Concern for Innovation Evaluation of University Teaching (Wilson). Evaluation of general effectiveness of teacher in comparison with other teachers. SIR-ETS. Student assessment of course to include exams, student-teacher interaction, teaching and techniques, and class texts. HEMEK-I, Section C. Student self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives: vocational, humanistic, critical thinking, human relations.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

E. Encounter or "T-group" "personal exploration" teaching. Some schools--like Johnston College of the University of Redlands--have institutionalized "encounter sessions" as a method of improving learning and resolving problems. Members of the groups are expected to study the characteristics of their own behavior and its effect on other members of the group. In other cases where it is not institutionalized, encounter or sensitivity group teaching-learning techniques are used by individual teachers in otherwise more traditional settings.

1. Teacher competence, experience, in leading such groups.
2. Confrontation policies.
3. Scholarly material presented in context.
4. Student scores, attitudes.
5. Changes in attitudes about self, others. Direction of change. Improved self-confidence?
6. Administrative attitudes, budget allocation.
7. Opportunity for individual meetings as supplement.
8. Behavioral changes.
9. Effect on other academic work, outside interests.
10. Attendance, participation.
11. Changes in style, content. History of program.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How have student attitudes changed? CHECK: pre-post, interviews, role playing

2. How is the group run? Do a few dominate? CHECK: interaction analysis

INNOVATION: Encounter, T-Group, Personal Exploration Teaching

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRATEGIES	COUN. STRATEGIES	T/S/V STRATEGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Johnston College Miami-Dade		X			Faculty, administration, and student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Individual Personal Development Freedom Community Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Freedom Institutional Esprit Concern for Innovation OPI. Pre-post testing, all 14 scales. HEMEK-II, Section B. Measure of the degree of a student's academic involvement and intensity on 5 learning style dimensions: academic, experiential, classroom activities, study habits, and instructional and learning experiences. HEMEK-II, Section C. Campus experience which were influential to changes in personality development: campus activities, notable experiences, areas and agents of change.

continued on page 2

INNOVATION: Encounter, T-Group, Personal Exploration Teaching, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-IV. Course Benefits Index. HEMEK-III, Section D. Students' reported priorities and those they assign society.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

F. Old lecture classes broken down in seminars. This is a modest innovation often designed to make required or over-crowded courses a little easier to swallow, and to restore at least a small amount of intimacy to the learning process at large universities.

1. Student test and attitude scores.
2. Teacher attitudes and preparation.
3. Amount of time for discussion, questions
4. Interaction in class discussion.
5. Attendance.
6. Use of office hours.
7. Interaction before and after class between students.
8. Student interaction with teacher after course completed and in office hours during course.
9. Off-campus meetings.
10. Content and style of teacher leadership.
11. Changes in structure and content of class from year to year. History of class.
12. Atmosphere in class. Tense? Relaxed? Formal? Informal?
13. Required reading, projects, papers.
14. Goals comparison and inventory.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Are seminars more effective means towards teaching? CHECK: elaborate evaluation design required

INNOVATION: Seminars in Lieu of Old Lecture Classes

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too Numerous to Mention		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Innovation Academic Development Community IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit
					HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation on indices: interpersonal orientation, dicussion, critical thinking, course benefits.
					Evaluation of University Teaching (Wilson). 5 teacher description scales by students and by colleagues.
					HEMEK-II Section A. Measure of college environment, specifically campus morale.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Seminars in Lieu of Old Lecture Classes, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-II Section B. Measure of the degree of a student's academic involvement and intensity. --------------------------------------- Faculty ratings of student competencies.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

G. Honors seminars for below-senior-level students (also applicable for senior honors seminars, though these are common, even traditional). Most of the issues and elements for evaluation are similar to those in "F. Old lecture classes broken down in seminars." Honors seminars, however, commonly present a few additional complexities. For example, professors are often content to renounce any leadership role in these seminars, and students are often highly competitive and anxious to win the favor of the professor and their fellow students by impressing them as a budding intellectual.

1. Patterns of interaction in class and before and after class.
2. Amount of direction provided by professor.
3. Competitiveness or cooperativeness of classroom atmosphere. Tense? Relaxed? Formal? Informal?
4. Required reading, outside reading.
5. Teacher's attitude towards class.
6. Revision in structure and content from year to year. History of course.
7. Amount of teacher preparation for class.
8. Criteria for selection to class.
9. Quality of discussions. Much tangential rambling? Trivia?
10. Amount of consultation during office hours.
11. Structure of rewards and sanctions.
12. Type of testing evaluation.
13. Amount of time for questions, discussion.
14. Teacher turnover, class life-span.
15. Goals comparison and inventory.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is there a problem of elitism? CHECK: attitude of students not admitted into program

2. How is admission to program determined? CHECK: by consent of instructor, by GPA, by recommendation

INNOVATION: Honors Seminars (Senior and Below-Senior Levels)

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too Numerous to Mention		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Freedom Community Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Freedom Institutional Esprit Concern for Innovation Course Comments Q--(UWGB). Student opinions about overall summary of course, teacher-student rapport, difficulty, general and specific cognitive development. HEMEK-IV. Teacher course evaluation, Course Benefits Index. Faculty rating of student competencies

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

I. Games and Game Simulation. "The use of simulated games to teach the principles of decision-making in human relations as well as more technical principles has received favorable acceptance in several schools. Its success rests on the degree to which the games or cases are realistic, and the extent to which they provide students with the opportunity to exercise and develop judgment in decision-making, or in the skills of diagnosis and response." (Heiss, p. 101.)

1. Sophistication of games.
2. Introduction to game.
3. Goals of teacher, students, game.
4. Attitude change, learning by students.
5. Amount of time learning carried over.
6. Coordination of game, simulation, with presentation of lecture, reading material; relevance to course material.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is the game 'real'? Is it an accurate representation? CHECK: people whose everyday activity is supposed to be represented by the game

2. Are the games integrated into the course structure? CHECK: course outlines, visits on days of games

INNOVATION: Games and Game Simulation

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Harvard Business Wharton School of Int. Relations, Norwestern School of Ind. Relations, Carnegie Mellon Dept. of Management Sciences UCB University of Illinois Indiana State Yale		X			HEMEK-III Section D. Classification of value emphases: Transcendence, impulse, reason, conscience, God's will. (Would be interesting to see if a shift in emphases occurs as a result of role played in game simulation.) HEMEK-III Section C. Personal traits and dispositons scales: Feelings about self, others, and future. (Pre and Post testing.) HEMEK-IV. Course Benefits Index. Faculty ratings of student competencies

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

H. Mixed media presentations, student presentations, and guest lecturers. These are options open to teachers which can be used to supplement the traditional lecture. Some professors even use these as the core of the class, providing occasional supplemental lectures.

1. Relevance, tie-in to regular lecture and reading material.
2. Amount of time for questions, discussion.
3. Introduction--(informative?)
4. Student reactions, ratings of program, learning.
5. For media and student presentations, technical and organizational quality.
6. Amount and kind of preliminary planning, communication between teacher and guest lecturer.
7. Supervision in planning student presentations.
8. Discrepancy between goals, communications, and introduction.
9. Amount of time learning carried over.
10. Credit, grading of student presentations.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS:

1. Are the presentations integrated into the course? CHECK: course outlines, visits on days of presentations

2. Are the presentations discussed and evaluated or treated as just another class? CHECK: follow up classes

Mixed Media Presentations

INNOVATION: Students' Guest Lecturers

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
See Heiss pgs. 102-106 Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium Flathead Valley Community College University of Georgia Grand Valley State Colleges Meharry Medical College Penn State Seton Hall Seattle University		X			HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation concerning: Teacher evaluation and feedback, Interpersonal orientation, Lecture, Discussion, Critical Thinking, Course Benefits Indexes. Faculty ratings of student competencies Course Comments Q (UWGB) Student opinion concerning overall summary judgment, orientation, difficulty, relevance.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

J. Apprenticeship, Internship, and Field Study. "A wide variety of two-year colleges offer their vocationally oriented students an opportunity to gain practical on-the-job experience with local business or industry. Usually these opportunities are defined by the nature of the community or by its needs for workers." (Heiss, p. 43.) Professional work experience in four-year colleges, like that offered by the University of Montana's speech and pathology department, are also known. The internship or supervised practicum has been accepted as a method for bringing the student into direct contact with the kinds of situations, encounters, and responsibilities that he will meet in his career. A large number of institutions offer internships in such diverse fields as college teaching, business, public administration, government, public policy, clinical psychology, and journalism.

1. "Complementarity" of two spheres.
2. Use of work experience to ground course work.
3. Job recruitment by school? Range of job opportunities available.
4. Use of campus resources while working.
5. Reports of work experience.
6. Comparison and inventory of student, faculty, administration goals.
7. Attitudes, sophistication of work-study students.
8. Selection process for prime jobs. Equitable?
9. Faculty attitudes to program.
10. Program administration.
11. Number involved.
12. Grading and evaluation.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Do students who use this program end up with better jobs? CHECK: follow up of students in program to those who did not enter program

2. Are students in the program less active in school activities? CHECK: activities lists

3. How easy is it for a student to transfer into or out of the program? CHECK: how much credit is lost, how much of the training is job specific

INNOVATION: Apprenticeship, Internship, Field Study

	INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Internship:	Florida State		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Individual Personal Development Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Public Service Innovation Off-Campus Learning IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation
	Michigan					
	Minnesota					
	UCLA					
	UCD					
	Cornell					
	Virginia					
Apprenticeship:	Olympic					
	Seattle Community					
	Orange Coast					
	Keuka					
	Wittenberg					
	Ohio State					HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimate of progress toward attainment of education objectives: Vocational.
	Meharry Medical					
	Marylhurst					
	Flint Junior					Davis Student Survey. Sections on Knowledge of/use/evaluation of work-learn programs.
	Adams State					
	San Mateo Community C.					
	University of Montana					
	University of Virginia					ISS-ACT. Student evaluation of: Instructors, Institutional Policies and Services.
Field Study:	Berkeley					
	Michigan State					
	Miami					
	Northeastern					

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

K. Study Abroad. "In the past decade the number of colleges and universities offering opportunities for study abroad have doubled to more than 600. Generally the experience is offered in the junior year. As a rule, students abroad live with private families and take courses in a nearby university. In other cases, students and their professors may live in a residence that includes classrooms and other educational facilities." (Heiss, p. 45.) Travel seminars operate under the same principle but for a shorter period of time; very often the three-month summer term is used in this way. Drew University offers such a session in Brussels on the European Economic Community. California State University at San Jose offers summer seminars and institutes in Africa for Afro-American studies majors.

1. Language and culture preparation, requirements.
2. Communications between campus faculty sponsors and students abroad, if any.
3. Financial aids--availability.
4. Selection process.
5. Measures of contribution of experience abroad.
6. Student activities abroad, including study; comparison of reports written before and after.
7. Language fluency before and after.
8. Administrative attitudes, budget allocations.
9. Change in program from year to year. History of program.
10. Program publicity--orientation.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does the program lead to elitism since only rich students can afford to go? CHECK: financial assistance to the needy

2. Do students find it difficult to readjust to campus life when they return? CHECK: interview students, check GPA, check activities list

3. Is there a grade or credit problem with the foreign courses? CHECK: transcripts, foreign catalogues

INNOVATION: Study--Abroad

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Princeton Wisconsin Columbia, Harvard, Cornell, Ill. Coop Antioch Hawaii US International University UC--All Campuses Stanford		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Intellectual Orientation Individual Personal Development Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness Innovation Off-Campus Learning IFI Intellectual-Aesthetic Extracurriculum Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Innovation
					Course Comments Q--(UWGB). Student opinions on: Summary judgment of course, teacher-student rapport, general and specific cognitive development, relevance.
					Davis Student Survey. Section on student knowledge of use/evaluation of study abroad progress.
					HEMEK-I. Education influence on development of students opinions and values. 6 scales.
					HEMEK-I. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of education objectives.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

L. Faculty Symposiums and Credit for Participation in College Governance. "Chatham College offers appropriately qualified students an opportunity to participate with two or more faculty members in an innovative experience called the Faculty Symposium. . . . [The student] participates in discourse and argumentation on a subject in which he and the faculty have both demonstrated interest and competence. The nature of involvement varies with the topic, but the student is expected to play an active role in researching and evaluating the investigative methodology and in supporting the means used to seek a solution. Variable credit hours can be earned depending upon the time spent on the symposium. At a few institutions credit is given to students participating with faculty and administrators in unicameral governance bodies." (Heiss, p. 101.)

1. Interaction patterns.
2. Selection process.
3. Attendance, enthusiasm, of student body.
4. Self-study, changes in program.
5. Feelings of rewards for participation.
6. Faculty, administration attitudes.
7. Goals of participants.
8. Measures of learning, attitude change.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is there a problem of elitism? CHECK: attitudes of students not admitted to the program

2. How is admission to the program determined? CHECK: consent of instructor, GPA, recommendation

Faculty Symposiums and Credit for

INNOVATION: Participation in College Governance

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Chatham College--Faculty Symposium		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Advanced Training Research Freedom Democratic Governance Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Democratic Governance Concern for Innovation --------------------------------- HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation, Course Benefits Index. --------------------------------- HEMEK-I. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of education objectives. 4 scales. --------------------------------- Evaluating University Teaching Q--Wilson. Scales concerning Instructor individual student interaction, dynamism enthusiasm.

continued on p. 2

Faculty Symposiums and Credit for

INNOVATION: Participation in College Governance, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					Course Comments Q--(UWGB). Scales concerning teacher-student rapport and relevance. HEMEK-II. Measure of the degree of student's academic involvement and intensity. ISS-ACT. Section on student opinion re institutional policies.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

M. Peer Counseling and Peer Tutoring.

1. Credit, money rewards for tutors, counselors.
2. Training programs for tutors, counselors.
3. Follow-up training of tutors, counselors.
4. Monitoring, record-keeping of meetings.
5. Ability to meet need by hiring sufficient number for sufficient number of hours.
6. Tutor, tutee selection process.
7. Campus visibility of program.
8. Physical facilities.
9. Matching for ethnicity when language, culture are barriers.
10. Ratio of tutors-tutees, counselors-counselees per ethnic group.
11. Entry requirements, accessibility to program.
12. Use of audio-visual aids in tutoring (reported by Reed to be of great value in encouraging independence in the learner).
13. Attitude, learning performance changes.
14. Administration attitude, budget allocations.
15. Self-study, evaluations.
16. Faculty, student satisfaction.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Who is doing the initiating, the tutor or the tutee? CHECK: history of the program, guidance office files

2. Who will dtermine who can be a tutor? CHECK: faculty, administration, open

INNOVATION: Peer Tutoring and Counseling

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Davis		X	X		Davis Student Survey items on: 1) Student use and evaluation of peer advising and counseling programs. 2) Student projected use of remedial and/or supplemental resources.
					Institutional Self-study Survey--ACT. 9-item student evaluation of institutional services.
					OPI. Pre-post testing on scales: Personal Integration, Anxiety Level, Autonomy.
					HEMEK-III, Section C. Scales: Feelings about Self, Other People, About the Future.
					HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives.
					Effectiveness measures: increase/decrease of students' learning performance; attitude change; behavior change; increased budget allocations.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

N. Special Intensive Counseling Programs. This broad category includes mandatory curriculum counseling, programs like that at Chatham College and "exploratory curriculum" programs and "personal and occupational options" courses like those offered at California State University at San Jose.

1. Number of staff, competence.
2. Satisfaction with program.
3. Visibility of services on campus, if not mandatory.
4. Accessibility of services.
5. Orientation program.
6. Students adaptation to college

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Who determines who is to receive counseling? CHECK: guidance office, director of program

2. See III.M.1

INNOVATION: Special Intensive Counseling Programs; Curriculum Counseling

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
UC, Irvine New College, Hofstra Manhattanville Southern Idaho College San Jose State Chatham College -------------------- California Coordinating Council for Higher Education Regional Learning Service of Central New York The Rhode Island College Urban Education Center of Rhode Island Women's Inner City Educational Resource Service			X		OPI. Pre-post testing. IDC, (TI, TO, Co, Es, Au, RO) HEMEK-III, Section C. Personal traits and dispositions to measure development of general experiences of maturing. Davis Student Survey. Section on student use/evaluation of advising and counselling program. HEMEK-II, Section B. Learning styles to measure degree of students' academic involvement and intensity. ISS-ACT. Sections on student opinion of usefulness of student services.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

N. Cluster Counseling. In cluster counseling, students are assigned, along with a small or moderate number of other students, to an adviser in his or her particular area of interest.

1. Training of counselors, experience in field.
2. Number of students assigned to each counselor.
3. Students' adjustment to institution, understanding of options, resources of school.
4. Administrative attitudes, budget allocations.
5. Student attitudes to program.
6. Procedure of visitation.
7. Frequency of visitations.
8. Physical facilities.
9. Amount of communication between counselors and specific departments, between counselors and students counseled.
10. Interaction in counseling sessions.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Do one or two students monopolize a councilor's time? CHECK: councilor's time sheets

2. See III.M.1

INNOVATION: Cluster Counseling

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Northeastern Southern Idaho Auburn Community College			X		Davis Student Survey. Section on student use/evaluation of advising and counseling programs and individuals, and student academic concerns. Also satisfaction ratings of various aspects of campus life. HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. ISS-ACT. Section on student evaluation of student services.

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

O. "Mentorship Teaching"

1. Frequency, productivity of sessions
2. Requirements
3. Student evaluation policy
4. Enthusiasm for learning, enhancement of creativity
5. Anxiety about mentor students which inhibits satisfaction, performance
6. Faculty attitudes about students, program
7. Administrative attitudes
8. Change in program; its history
9. Number of sessions missed by faculty and students
10. Analysis of interaction (rewards, sanctions, body language, etc.) process, measure of formality-informality
11. Goals discrepancy

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Are other resources used besides the mentor? CHECK: course plan

INNOVATION: Mentorship Teaching

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Empire State Tufts "College Within"		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Freedom Democratic Governance Community Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Freedom Democratic Governance Institutional Esprit Concern for Innovation --- HEMEK -IV. Measures of contexts and processes. 1. College environments (abbreviate CUES scales). 2. Quality of teaching and faculty-student relations. 3. Campus morale. --- HEMEK -IV. Measures of degree of student's academic involvement and intensity. 1. Learning styles.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Mentorship Teaching, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-IV. Influential experiences. Factors on areas and agents of change, and general satisfaction. Faculty Characteristics Q--Wilson, Gaf Faculty attitude scales concerned with: Personalization of faculty-student interaction, student motivation, job satisfaction.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

P. Office of the Ombudsman. "Ombudspersons" serve as a buffer between the students and the campus offices of instruction and adminstration. In addition to protecting students from capricious faculty demands or judgments, the ombudsman is often able to convincingly explain to students the administration's rationale for educational decisions.

1. Variety and number of problems handled.
2. Visibility on campus and accessibility.
3. Success and vigor of advocacy.
4. Relations with faculty, administration.
5. Interest in academic reform; participation, initiation in academic or administrative reform actions.
6. Staff help, if necessary.
7. Kinds of students served, kinds not seeking service.
8. Student satisfaction.
9. Records, files.
10. Budget, salary, rewards.
11. Impartiality.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is the ombudsman publicized? CHECK: student publications, orientation handbook

2. Who is the ombudsman responsible to and how much authority does he have? CHECK: administration

3. Is the ombudsman impartial? CHECK: procedures, decisions

INNOVATION: Office of the Ombudsman

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Cornell Kent State San Jose State Berkeley UCLA			×		Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Freedom Democratic Governance Community IFI Freedom Concern for Undergraduate Learning Democratic Governance Institutional Esprit HEMEK-II, Section A. Measures of processes and contexts: environment, quality of teaching and faculty-student relations, campus morale. Davis Student Survey. Sections on satisfaction ratings of various aspects of campus life.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

Q. All pass-fail grading (or derivative) with or without teacher, self-evaluations.

1. Mechanism to allow students wanting to attend graduate school to be evaluated.
2. Ability to place graduates in graduate schools, jobs.
3. Atmosphere in classes.
4. Usefulness of teacher, self-evaluations.
5. Breadth of courses taken by students.
6. Abilities of graduates.
7. Papers, projects.
8. Students' satisfaction with university life.
9. History of grading system, changes (addition of honors category? etc.).

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is there a problem getting into graduate school? CHECK: success rate of applicants, spot check graduate school requirements

2. Do the students receive enough constructive evaluative feedback? CHECK: students

INNOVATION: Pass-Fail Grading

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too numerous to mention				X	Davis Student Survey. Section on student academic concerns (emphasis on grading). ISS-ACT. Section on student assessment of institutional policies. SIR-ETS. Items concerning courses and exams.

III. Teaching and Counseling Strategies

R. Pass-fail grading outside of major.

1. Mechanism to allow students wanting to attend graduate school to be evaluated.
2. Ability to place graduates in graduate schools, jobs.
3. Atmosphere in classes.
4. Usefulness of teacher, self-evaluations.
5. Breadth of courses taken by students.
6. Abilities of graduates.
7. Students' satisfaction with university life.
8. Papers, projects.
9. History of grading system, changes (addition of honors category? etc.).

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is the student as conscientous when taking courses outside the major? CHECK: amount of time and effort spent on course

2. Is there a problem if the student switches majors? CHECK: procedure for turning P/F into a grade

INNOVATION: Pass-Fail Grading outside of Major

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too large to mention				X	Davis Student Survey. Section on student academic concerns (emphasis on grading). SIR-ETS. Items concerning courses and exams. HEMEK-IV. 15-item index on course benefits.

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

S. Cumulative Portfolio

"Several institutions use a cumulative system of evaluation by which in addition to or in lieu of letter grades, written comments by instructors, self-evaluative statements by the student, samples of work performance such as written assignments, project reports, tapes, photographs, or other evidence of the student's achievements are collected during the student's college career. Students are encouraged to keep logs in which they record their activities and assess their progress" (Heiss, p. 111).

1. Enhancement of creativity, learning
2. Policy of portfolio evaluation
3. Portfolio requirements
4. Progress sessions--other feedback
5. Scope of Types of Portfolios accepted
6. Goals, satisfaction
7. Measure enthusiasm for learning
8. Amount of time, competition on cultivation of portfolio
9. Administrative, faculty attitudes
10. Changes in program; its history

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is there a problem getting into graduate school? CHECK: success rate of applicants and spot check graduate schools

2. How much flexibility is there in what determines a portfolio? CHECK: school requirements

INNOVATION: Cumulative Portfolio

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Evergreen State Johnston College, Univ. of Redlands Whittier Ottawa Manhattanville Antioch West				X	Davis Student Survey. Student academi concerns (emphasis on grading). ISS-ACT. Section on student evaluation of institutional policies. HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimate of progress toward attainment of educational objectives.

T. Comprehensive Examination Concept

"Many undergraduate colleges have revived and revised the comprehensive examination as a device to encourage the student to develop the ability to organize, integrate, and relate knowledge, to adopt study habits that will enhance learning. . .to take responsibility for his own education. . .and test his ability to extemporize on problems on propositions. The examination is given in the senior year and may be oral, written or both" (Heiss, p. 113). The examination can either cover the student's major field only or his total program.

1. Reputation of the comprehensive amount discussed on campus
2. Annual changes in content? Its history
3. Administration of the comprehensive, training for administration, personality of test administrators
4. Evaluations of fairness of test by students, faculty
5. Grade appeal process, amount used, provisions for retesting
6. Strategies developed by students for passing comprehensive
7. Stated and achieved goals
8. Faculty, administrative attitudes toward test
9. Physical setting of test
10. Availability of preparational help, information, usefulness of that information
11. Abilities of graduates
12. Consultation on development of test

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is the student given adequate evaluative feedback before the comprehensive? CHECK: course evaluation system

2. Is the comprehensive also a learning tool or is it just a test? CHECK: availability of grader to the student, can the student see his examiners before the test

INNOVATION: Comprehensive Exam Concept

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Macalester Beloit Dunbarton College of Holy Cross Haverford Stanford NYU Columbia Aquinas College Swarthmore College of Letters & Science, UCB Brown-Pembroke MIT Hampshire		X		X	Faculty, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Advanced Training IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge -- Student assessment of courses and exams. ISS-ACT. Student evaluation of institutional policies. Davis Student Survey. Section on student academic concerns (emphasis on grading). HEMEK-IV Section C. Course Benefits Index.

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

U. Outside Examiners

"Usually these are supervisory personnel with whom the student worked while off campus, but in some cases experts in a substantive area are asked to examine the student or to prepare questions for his examinations. Advanced students are occasionally used for this same purpose." (Heiss, p. 112)

1. Increased student empathy with examiner, vice versa
2. Fairness of examiner
3. Student attitudes toward examination--changes?
4. Cost of outside examiners
5. Expertise of examiners
6. Student grades on examinations--difference with grades before program instituted
7. Faculty attitudes toward examiners
8. Changes in type of people hired as examiners

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See III.T.1&2

INNOVATION: Outside Examiners

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
See Heiss, p. 112. None mentioned.				X	SIR-ETS. Student assessment of courses and exams. ISS-ACT. Student evaluation of institutional policies. Davis Student Survey. Section on student academic concerns (emphasis on grading). HEMEK-IV Section C. Course Benefits Index.

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

V. Micro-teaching Evaluations

"Many major universities use closed-circuit television to evaluate the teaching skills or effectiveness of their teaching interns. . . . Classroom performances are recorded and played back later for self-evaluation by the teaching supervisor or the instructor's peers." (Heiss, p. 115)

1. Types of personnel evaluating
2. Effect of tape on teaching--obtrusiveness, imposition on academic freedom?
3. Criteria for evaluation
4. Improvements in teaching, confidence, style, content effectiveness after evaluation
5. Confidentiality guarantees
6. Leaks to the press? to the Erwin Committee? Use to historians?
7. Interaction processes in evaluation sessions.
8. Changes in student attitudes to teacher, performance after exposure to evaluation program

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is an effort made to make sure the teacher has no stage fright? CHECK: is the instructor always told when he will be filmed

INNOVATION: Micro-Teaching Evaluation for Teaching Interns

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Michigan State Stanford University of West Virginia Harvard University of Michigan Carleton St. Olaf		X			Faculty, student scores on IFI scales: IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Innovation

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

W. Peer Teaching Evaluations

1. Types of personnel evaluating, objectivity
2. Number of visits before report made
3. Criteria for final evaluation
4. Feedback process before final evaluation, after final evaluation
5. Reactive effects of evaluators on teaching--obtrusiveness
6. Interaction processes in evaluation sessions
7. Coaching of students before evaluators' visits?
8. Improvements in teaching confidence, style, content, effectiveness after evaluation

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Are peers evaluating content and intellectual integrity or success with students? CHECK: rating forms

2. What role, in the larger evaluation scheme, does peer evaluations play? CHECK: system of teacher evaluation

INNOVATION: Evaluation of Peer Teachers

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too Numerous to Mention		X			HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimate of progress toward attainment of educational objectives.
					Illinois CEQ. Sections on Method of instruction, Content, and Instructor.

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

X. Faculty Growth Programs

"Essentially, these are in-service programs in which information and demonstrations are given on effective teaching methods, the use of new instructional media or technology and the results of research on effective teaching." (Heiss, p. 115)

1. Organisation of programme, planning
2. Research of program organisers
3. Questions asked
4. Use of methods, research, media introduced in programs
5. Socio-emotional gains
6. Correspondence between reports and teacher needs
7. Rewards for participation
8. Faculty attitudes toward program
9. Changes in teaching, student learning after program

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How are the faculty compensated for time in the program? money? reduced course load? CHECK: program plan

2. Is there a follow up to see if teaching actually improves? CHECK: program plan

INNOVATION: Faculty Growth Programs

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Vermont College Northwestern Nebraska Wright Institute (From Heiss)		X			Pre-post testing. Evaluating University Teaching (Wilso Student evaluation of teaching effectiveness (in comparison with other teachers).
El Paso Community College Framingham State Macalester Sheldon Jackson College					Colleague evaluation of teaching effectiveness.
					Faculty scores on selected IGI and IFI scales: IGI Community Innovation Democratic Governance Freedom IFI Institutional Esprit Concern for Innovation Democratic Governance Freedom

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

Y. Faculty Retreats

"Some colleges have recently initiated faculty retreats, seminars or conferences during which a problem or problems of major concern to the institution and its faculty are examined intensively. In some cases the retreat is used for curriculum coordination or planning purposes. In other cases it is used for information purposes." (Heiss, p. 116)

1. Oranisation and planning of program
2. Research on problems and their presentation
3. Socio-emotional gains
4. Correspondence between reports and teacher needs
5. Rewards for participation
6. Faculty, administrative attitudes toward program
7. Substantive changes resulting from program

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See III.X.1

2. Can students play a role in these retreats? CHECK: program plan

INNOVATION: Faculty Retreats

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
St. Louis University University of Mississippi Illinois Rochester U. C.		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales, particularly: IGI Advanced Training Research Freedom Democratic Governance Community Innovation Accountability/Efficiency IFI Freedom Concern for Undergraduate Learning Democratic Governance Self-Study and Planning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit ---------------------------------- Faculty Characteristics Q--Wilson, Bavry and Gaff: 3 scales for self-reported teaching practices. 6 scales concerned with faculty attitudes.

Z. Fixed-term Tenure Plan

"A few institutions have replaced the traditional tenure plan with a negotiated fixed-term plan in which the professor submits a proposal of what he would like to accomplish in teaching, research and public service during his appointment. He further indicates how he would like to distribute his time among these activities. After a contract is negotiated the proposal becomes part of the appointment contract. Included in the agreement are criteria for reappointment at the end of the designated term. The contract is amenable by mutual consent." (Heiss, p. 116)

1. Composition of contract committee
2. Scope of contracts accepted
3. Incentives to meet contract
4. Difficulty of emendation process
5. Basic requirements
6. Evaluation process--feedback provisions
7. Rate of returning faculty--changes in later contracts
8. Types of contracts rejected
9. Correspondence between faculty contracts and student, community, research needs
10. Amount of research done by contract committee with regard to institution's needs
11. Types of complaints over rejected reappointment
12. Faculty attitudes

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How much discrepancy is there between the contract goals and what is accomplished? CHECK: contract and finished product

INNOVATION: Fixed-Term Tenure Plan

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Hampshire College		X		X	Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Advanced Training Research Public Service Innovation Meeting Local Needs IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation ------------------------------ Illinois CEQ. Collect student attitude about particular courses: method of instruction, content, interest and attention, instructor. Faculty Characteristics Questionnaire (Wilson-Gaff). Faculty self-reported teaching practices, and 6 attitude scales. (Includes job satisfaction scale.) Evaluating University Teaching (Wilson) Assessment of teaching effectiveness by students and by colleagues.

III TEACHING AND COUNSELING STRATEGIES

AA. Competency-based Learning

1. Degree awarded for attainment of competencies rather than credit hours accumulated
2. Student assessment may take place outside the classroom environment
3. Integration of program under college wide competencies rather than individual, unrelated courses
4. Ability of students to accelerate or take more time since degree is not awarded for accumulation of course credits
5. Better student understanding of what is expected of them
6. Better student understanding of what a college degree means and of what it prepares them to do
7. Desire to move to criterion referencing and away from norming
8. Faculty are required to be explicit about the content of their courses

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is counseling available so that students used to the course credit method can adjust to competencies? CHECK: availability of counseling, students, both freshman and transfer

2. Are new assessment options available or must students still take certain courses to attain competencies? CHECK: statement of competencies and methods of assessment

3. Do students find the competencies restraining? Do they feel certain options have been taken away? CHECK: students, students who were accepted but declined to enroll

4. How are schools establishing levels of competence? CHECK: for possible norming, if referencing, what are the criteria and to what end are they selected, final usage, for college growth over time sequencing, to form a base for lifelong learning

INNOVATION: Competency-based Learning

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
University of Albuquerque Alverno College Bowling Green State Univ. UC Riverside Extension ETS Florida State Grand Valley State Colleges Hampshire College, Mass. Minnesota Metro State College College for Human Service, New York Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio Mt. Hood Community College, Oregon Sterling College, Kansas Univ. of Massachusetts, Boston Ottawa University, Kansas Governors State College, Ill. Mars Hill College, N. C.		X			SIR-ETS. Student assessment of courses and instruction. Includes exams, student-teacher interaction, teaching, and techniques. HEMEK-I. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. CUES. For determining intellectual-social-cultural climate of the campus on 5 scales.

IV. DELIVERY SYSTEMS INNOVATIONS

GENERAL EVALUATION STRATEGIES FOR DELIVERY SYSTEMS INNOVATIONS

1. Interviews with students, faculty, and administrators both involved with the innovation and university wide.
2. Comparison of how students using the new delivery system compare to students not using it.
3. Compare amount of independent study and instructional innovation before and after the change. Has the new delivery system acted as an innovative catalyst?
4. Compare student attendance under old and new systems as an indicator of interest.
5. Use of indicators of program success such as drop out rate and matriculation rate, both in the innovative program and the standard program.
6. Visits by external and internal evaluators.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

A. Cluster Colleges. Mutual assistance pacts between colleges, consortia exchanges and other similar cooperative programs. "Over 1000 institutions of higher education now participate in cooperative activities with one or more other institutions. These include such formal organisational arrangements as consortiums, cooperative unions. . .and mutual-assistance pacts, as well as such informal programs as cross-registration, shared computer time, library interchanges, and reciprocal course-credit plans." (Heiss, p. 117)

1. Amount, frequency of exchange--increase/decrease over time
2. Frequency of contact between program administrators in various institutions
3. Satisfaction of mutual needs
4. Pre-planning; determination of needs
5. Consensus of goals
6. Transportation, if necessary
7. Student attitudes, learning
8. Administrative attitudes
9. Faculty attitudes
10. Budgetary savings, if applicable (increasing/decreasing); budget allocations
11. Administrative efficiency
12. Changes of program over time
13. Ease of transferring credit, if applicable

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How do the students in one college do when taking courses in another college? CHECK: grade sheets, course enrollments

2. Does the sharing of facilities lead to increased cost effectiveness? CHECK: financial records

INNOVATION: Cluster Colleges

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
UCSC UOP -- Raymond College MSU -- James Madison College UCSD -- Third College Western Washington State U Conn -- The Inner College Cal State -- Sonoma Claremont Colleges Mississippi Junior College Consortium New Hampshire Consortium Michigan-Tuskeegee Program		X		X	Student, faculty, administration IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Meeting Local Needs Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation --- ISS-ACT student evaluation of instructors, institutional policies and services. HEMEK-II Section A. Section on quality of learning and faculty-student relations. HEMEK-III Section C. Personal traits and dispositions. 6 scales measuring general experiences of maturing. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation. Course Benefits Index. Davis Student Survey. Sections on student use and evaluation of auxiliary programs and individuals.

B. Universities Without Walls. To provide a degree program for more kinds of students--especially for those whose opportunities are circumscribed by work, special social problems, travel or special service abroad, and to capitalize on their special resources--the Union of Experimenting Colleges and Universities has organized approximately 20 institutions in a cooperative venture called 'The University Without Walls'. Abandoning such traditional practices as a fixed age group, a set time-frame, the classroom as the principal place of instruction, prescribed curriculum, grades and unit credits, the aim of the University Without Wall is to produce creative life-long learners by consideration of thier short-term and long-term goals and by giving them opportunities for self-development.

1. Inventory of Learning Resources; preparation, comprehensiveness
2. Selection process, criteria for selection
3. Frequency, productivity of contact with faculty
4. Student-faculty-administration, attitudes
5. Administrative efficiency, planning
6. follow up on self-study
7. Goals of administration-faculty-student relationship of attempts to goals
8. Supplemental funding
9. Attitudes of faculty and counselors
10. Abilities of graduates

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How much learning is lost because of the lack of a central campus?

CHECK: requires detailed experimental design

2. Are certain faculty members overworked? CHECK: course enrollments

INNOVATION: Universities Without Walls

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRATEGIES	COUN. STRATEGIES	T/S/V STRATEGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
UWW; Yellow Springs, Ohio Empire State, Manhattan Learning Center		X		X	Faculty, student, administration IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Individual Personal Development Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Social Egalitarianism Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Human Diversity Concern for Undergraduate Learning Meeting Local Needs Concern for Innovation
DEVELOPING NEW UWW UNITS Univ. of Alabama (New College) Antioch College Bard College Universidad Boricua Chicago State University College of Racine Florida International University Franconia College Friends World College Goddard Hofstra University Harvard University Johnston College Kirkland College Loretto Heights College University of Massachusetts University of Minnesota Morgan State Northeastern Illinois University					SIR-ETS. Student assessment of courses and instruction. Selected items which are not directed toward classroom instruction. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation. Course Benefits Index. Faculty ratings of student competencie Cost measures.

--continued on page 2

INNOVATION: Universities Without Walls, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT- EGIES	COUN. STRAT- EGIES	T/S/V STRAT- EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
University of the Pacific					
Pitzer College					
Roger Williams College					
Shaw University					
Skidmore College					
University of South Carolina					
Staten Island Community College					
Stephens					
Webster College					
Westminster College					
University of Wisconsin at Green Bay					

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

C Mini-colleges (Experimental Colleges)--"Characteristically, experimental or mini-colleges are distinguished by small size, high faculty-student involvement in curricular planning, flexible requirements, varied instructional methods, and student-centered rather than discipline centered programs. In most cases the academic plan is thematic and consequently interdisciplinary. Most experimental colleges have used a blend of styles rather than creating an entirely new kind of institution. Their programs are a response to the demands of students for education that promotes a sense of community and offers opportunities for independent study and exposure to social-action projects" (Heiss, p. 25)

1. Self-study system, self evaluation process
2. Fulfillment of goals, where measureable
3. Goals consensus; efforts to achieve
4. Basic administrative efficiency, competence attitudes.
5. Changes in structure, content over time
6. Enrollment
7. Budget, outside funding
8. Physical facilities, maintenance

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How do students in the mini-college do in the college at large?

CHECK: grades, course enrollments

2. How is admissions decided and does it lead to elitism? CHECK: administration, interview students both in and out of program

INNOVATION: Mini-Colleges (Experimental Colleges)

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Johnston College--Redlands Montieth College Fairhaven College New College, University of Hawaii New College, University of Alabama		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Individual Personal Development Social Criticism/Activism Democratic Governance Community Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Improvement of Society Democratic Governance Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit
					OPI. Pre-post testing IDC.
					HEMEK-I Section A. Student activities scales related to behavioral definition of a liberal education.
					HEMEK-I Section B. Educational influence on development of student attitudes and values. 6 attitude scales.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Mini-Colleges (Experimental Colleges), p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates toward attainment of educational objectives. 4 progress scales.
					HEMEK-II Section A. Measures for the college environment, 5 abbreviated CUES scales; quality of teaching; and campus morale.
					HEMEK-II Section B. Degree of student's academic involvement and intensity. 5 learning styles
					HEMEK-II Section C. Influential experiences related to changes in personality development: Campus activities, reforms; notable experiences; areas and agents of change; general satisfaction with college.
					SIR-ETS. Student assessment college courses and instruction: exams, student-teacher interaction, teaching and techniques, class texts.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

D. Optive Colleges. New interdisciplinary colleges within universities. These are somewhat like the mini-colleges in that they are smaller units operating within the traditional university structure and in that they try to subvert the "alienating: aspects of the larger, more complex and more bureaucratic structure. Their mode of subversion, however, is more traditional--the attempt to restore the liberal education tradition within the multi-versity setting. The colleges sometimes admit only select students and are generally composed of tenured faculty and organized around a topic-oriented curriculum. Many of these colleges' students live, as well as study, together.

1. Selection process
2. Drop-out rate
3. Student attitudes
4. Self-evaluation process, changes in program over time
5. Faculty attitudes
6. Student performance - graduate abilities
7. Physical facilities
8. Budget allocations, administrative attitudes
9. Psychological effects
10. Goals of those involved

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV. C. 1&2

INNOVATION: Optive Colleges

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
New College--Hofstra New College--Cal State San Jose Tufts "College Within" Experimental College--Dartmouth Experimental College--San Francisco State New College--Nasson Justin Morrell College--Michigan State Hutchins College--Sonoma State Huxley College--Washington State Centennial College--University of Kansas Experimental College--University of California Berkeley		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness Advanced Training Social Criticism/Activism Freedom Community Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit
					HEMEK-II Section A. Measures of college environment, quality of teaching, campus morale.
					HEMEK-II Section B. Measure of degree of students' academic involvement and intensity-5 learning styles.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Optive Colleges, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-II Section C. Influential experiences, specifically campus events and reforms, areas and agents of change, and general satisfaction with college.
					Evaluation of University Teaching (Wilson). Teaching behavior and effectiveness of teaching practices.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

E. International Colleges - "Friend's World College (the main example of an international world college) was founded in 1965 to provide students with in-depth knowledge and first-hand experiences in a culture other than their own, as well as to promote an understanding of several other cultures and developing regions. The college is committed to developing change agents whose work might help create a better world. To this end, the entire world is treated as a classroom, students study problems in their actual social settings and the curriculum revolves around the emerging concepts that are shaping the future of mankind. The college has seven fixed centers to which students are rotated every six months.....The faculty serve essentially as resource persons, consultants, and contact personnel." (Heiss, p.8)

1. Lanuage and culture pre-training
2. Selection process
3. Availability of financial aids
4. Frequency, productivity of student contacts with faculty
5. Self-study, changes in program over time
6. Requirements, evaluation of student work
7. Correspondence between goals and results
8. Curriculum selection process
9. Views of Friend's World students by people of countries they study.
10. Final reports

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Do students have trouble getting into graduate school? CHECK: graduate school admissions

2. Is the quality of the fixed centers even? CHECK: requires experimental design

INNOVATION: International Colleges

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Chapman College Friends World College		X		X	Student, faculty, administration IGI and IFI scores on scales. IGI Academic Development Humanism/Altruism Cultural/Aesthetic Awareness Advanced Training Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency IFI Intellectual/Aesthetic Extracurriculum Human Diversity Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Improvement of Society OPI. Pre-post testing, 14 scales. HEMEK-I Section A. 9 activities scales related to objectives of liberal education. HEMEK-I Section B. Assessment of college's educational influence on development of students' opinions and values. 6 attitude scales. HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attaining educational objectives. 4 progress scales.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

F. Living learning units - "Over 250 colleges and universities have extended teaching-learning discourse beyond the classroom by using student residence halls for learning as well as for living space. The placement of small classrooms, study units, faculty offices and advisory services in freshmen and sophomore residence halls had been sometimes successful in mitigating the unpersonal quality and alienation of larger institutions. Usually the living-learning space is used for teaching those segments of the general education program that lend themselves to small-group discussion but in some cases other facilities are also available for instruction or self-instruction. Some newly-designed living-learning units include apartments for faculty advisors and graduate student counselors who live-in" (Heiss, p. 35)

1. Fellings of restriction
2. Student attitudes, learning
3. Faculty, administration attitudes
4. Goals-comparison by discrepancy
5. Budget allocations
6. Returning students
7. Student adjustment to college
8. Comfort, informality or learning situation
9. Flexibility of use of space, maintenance of facilities
10. Use of faculty offices, advisory services
11. Drop-out rate
12. Planning, preliminary study of living-learning units elsewhere

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV.C.1

2. Do students in the unit make less use of the university wide facilities?

CHECK: clubs joined, activity participation

3. See IV. C. 2

INNOVATION: Living-Learning Units

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Ripon Michigan St. Mary of the Woods Wheaton Michigan State Livingston Rutgers St. Olaf's Colby Franconia UCB UCSD		X			Faculty, student, and administration IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Individual Personal Development Community Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit
					ISS-ACT. Student evaluation of instructors, and institutional policies and practices. Davis Student Survey. Satisfaction ratings of various aspects of campus life. HEMEK-I, Section A. Activities scale related to behavioral definitions of a liberal education (9 scales). HEMEK-I, Section B. Educational influence on development of students'

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Living-Learning Units, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					opinions and values. 6 scales. HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attaining educational objectives. 4 progress scales. HEMEK-II. Measure of educational processes and contexts: college environment, learning styles. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation, specifically the Interpersonal Orientation Index and the Course Benefits Index.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

G. Theme Houses- "In an effort to provide facilities for deep immersion in a particular area, some colleges operate theme houses where students working in the same area of concentration, or freshmen studying the same general education option, live together for some part of their college program. Usually, in addition to classrooms, reading rooms, and faculty offices, the theme house provides social and recreational resources and opportunities for peer interaction or for interaction between students, faculty and advisers. Some theme houses have expanded to include learning recource centers, placement services and career counseling offices". (Heiss,36)

1. Student learning
2. Faculty, administration attitudes
3. Enrollment figures, drop-out figures
4. Goals-comparison by discrepancy
5. Budget allocations, increase-decrease
6. Student adjustment to college, career, anxiety, feelings of restriction (student attitudes)
7. Comfort, informality of learning situation
8. Use of space
9. Use of Faculty offices, advisory services, recreation facilities
10. Planning, preliminary study of theme houses elsewhere
11. Supplemental funding
12. Use of potential resources

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV.F.1-3

INNOVATION: Theme Houses

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Stanford Dartmouth Stephens College University of Wisconsin		X			Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Individual Personal Development Community Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Institutional Esprit
					OPI. Pre-post testing. 14 scales.
					Davis Student Survey. Sections on student use and evaluation of auxiliary programs and individuals, use and evaluation of advising and counseling programs, and satisfaction ratings of various aspects of campus life.
					HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation: Interpersonal Orientation, Lecture, Discussion, Critical Thinking, and Course Benefits Index.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Theme Houses, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-I Section B. Educational influence on student development. 6 attitude scales and 4 self-estimated progress scales.
					HEMEK-II Section B. Degree of student's academic involvement and intensity on 5 learning scales.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

H. The Three year Baccalaureate--"Recommended by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, the 3 year bachelor's degree is being adopted by a growing number of colleges. To shorten the time it takes to earn the degree, schools variously (1) give students credit on the basis of examinations, (2) allow credit for college level work during high school, (3) recommend that the student take courses in the summer or more than a normal load during the regular academic year, or (4) revise their curriculum for operation on a three-year cycle." (Heiss, 78)

1. Students learning ability of 3-year graduates
2. Job, graduate school success
3. Scope of courses taken, breadth requirements (if any)
4. Criteria for selection in 3-year program, if applicable
5. Difficulty of examinations for which credit is given, if applicable
6. Student, faculty administration attitudes (too much pressure, too little opportunity for other pursuits)
7. Amount of time studying, attending class
8. OPI scores before and after
9. Drop-out rate
10. Savings to college

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. How do students compare to four year graduates? CHECK· graduate schools, professional schools, work record

2. How much do the students enjoy the speeded up college experience? CHECK: student interviews, pre-post for affect

INNOVATION: Three-Year Baccalaureate

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
New College, Calif.; 3-year only SUNY, Brockport; 3-year only George Washington SUNY Albany Ripon St. Lawrence Goucher Muskingum Concord Emory St. Norbert West De Pere Minnesota State College System Utah State Evergreen State (developing)				X	Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Vocational Preparation Innovation Off-Campus Learning Accountability/Efficiency Meeting Local Needs IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Innovation Meeting Local Needs OPI. Pre-post testing. Faculty Characteristics Questionnaire (Wilson-Gaff). Faculty attitudes toward students, educational change, and job satisfaction. HEMEK-I Section B. Education influenc on development of student opinions and values. 6 scales. HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. . HEMEK-II Section A. Measures of the college environment: campus, quality of teaching, and campus morale.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Three-Year Baccalaureate, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRATEGIES	COUN. STRATEGIES	T/S/V STRATEGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					HEMEK-II Section B. Degree of students' academic involvement and intensity: learning styles. ISS-ACT. Sections on student evaluation of instructor, institutional policies and services SIR-ETS. Student assessment of courses and instruction: exams, student-teacher interaction, teaching and techniques.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEM

I. Doctor of Arts, Master of Philosophy, Specialist and other new degrees

1. Number of candidates for degree (increase-decline)
2. Consensus of meaning of degree
3. Ability to use degree to satisfy goals, especially placement in job
4. Comparative progress of program
5. Level of acceptance of degree by appropriate agencies
6. Student-faculty-administration attitudes to degree
7. Degree requirements (Areas missed?)
8. Planning, feasibility studies
9. Drop-out rate

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Are students with new degrees accepted in the job market? CHECK: hiring record

INNOVATION: New Degrees: Doctor of Arts, Master of Philosophy, Specialist

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Berkeley -- Sesame Doctor of Arts a. Carnegie-Mellon b. Univ. of Washington c. Dartmouth d. Rutgers e. Kansas State Doctorate in Substantive Field -- Univ. of Illinois Candidate in Philosophy -- Michigan, Berkeley Master of Philosophy -- Yale, Toronto Master of Arts in Teaching -- Tennessee, UCB Diplomate -- Univ. of Miami, Fla. Specialist -- Michigan, Western Michigan				X	Faculty, student, administration IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Advanced Training Research Innovation Accountability/Efficiency IFI Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Innovation -- ISS-ACT. Graduate student evaluation of instructors, institutional policies and services.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

J. External Degree - "In some cases the degree is offered to those who take most if not all of their courses off campus. In other cases, it appeals to those who can take some work on campus on a part-time basis and complete the program in independent study off campus. In some cases, the external degree program is independent of the regular degree programs of the institution. In other cases, it becomes an integral part of the institutions regular degree programs and is designed, developed, staffed and supervised by the regular faculty." (Heiss, p 81)

1. Off campus learning centers
2. Degree requirements
3. Enrollment figures-drop-out rate
4. Demand for service
5. Administration of program materials
6. Evaluation methods
7. Market value of degree
8. Student-faculty-administration attitudes
9. Students learning
10. Level of acceptance of degree in appropriate agencies
11. Self-study, evaluation and preliminary study ..

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV.B.1&2

2. Are students with external degrees accepted in the job market?

CHECK: compare students in same subject but with traditional degree

INNOVATION: External Degree

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Empire State Nova Univ. of Massachusetts, Amherst Capitol University Center, Connecticut Framingham State College, Massachusetts Univ. of Alabama California State Colleges and University System, Chico State University of Northern Colorado Florida International University, School of Independent Studies Central Michigan University SUNY, Regents External Degree Minnesota Metro State College Community College of Vermont Extended Univ. of University of California		X		X	Faculty, student, administration IGI scores on scales: Vocational Preparation Meeting Local Needs Social Egalitarianism Innovation Accountability/Efficiency HEMEK-III, Section D. Classification of value emphases: Transcendent, Impulse, Reason, Conscience, God's Will (Kahn). Students' reported priorities for self and those for society. HEMEK-II, Section B. Measure of degree of students' academic involvement and intensity. SIR-ETS. Assessment of courses and instruction, student-teacher interaction, teaching and techniques, courses, class texts. Cost/benefit measures. Faculty rating of student competencies.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

K. Change from credit hour to course credit. "The students progress toward the degree is evaluated in terms of the kinds of course he has completed rather than in terms of the number of units he has acquired. Usually a student is required to take 32 semester courses to satisfy his baccalaureate requirements in place of the 120 credit hours norm previously required." (Heiss, p. 42)

1. Student-faculty-administration attitudes.
2. Simplification of administration ?
3. Reduction of students freedom of choice.
4. Breadth of courses taken, offered.
5. Decrease in special interest classes.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is administration and record keeping simplified? CHECK: interview administrators, check registrar's records

2. Is the switch just? Is course work homogenous? CHECK: course syllabi

INNOVATION: Change from Credit-Hour to Course Credit

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Wittenburg Brown-Pembroke				X	Faculty, administration, student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Innovation Concern for Advancing Knowledge --- OPI. Pre-post testing (students' attitudes, values, and interests). ISS-ACT. Student attitudes and evaluation of institutional policies. HEMEK-II Section C. Student experiences perceived to be influential in personality development. 6-item scale on areas and agents of change. HEMEK-I Section B. Educational influence on student development. 6 attitude scales. HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attaining educational objectives. 4 progress scales. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation: Interpersonal Orientation Index, Lecture Index, Discussion Index, Critical Thinking Index, and Course Benefits Index.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

L. Intersession or 4-1-4 Calendar. "This innovation arranges the calendar so that the fall semester ends before the Christmas break. After Christmas vacation there is a one month term followed by another full semester. During this intermediate term the student can devote his time to a single intensive experience--doing independent study, giving community service, engaging in a special seminar, traveling and/or doing research under supervision." (Heiss p.47)

1. Breadth of intersession offerings.
2. Availability of intersession financial aids.
3. Cooperating programs--administration, transportation, frequency of exchange.
4. Satisfaction of student interests.
5. Faculty, administration attitudes
6. History of form. Changes in enthusiasm, etc. over time.
7. Mechanism for student generation of intersession offering.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is the "1" isolated or do the courses students take relate to the "1" experience? CHECK: correlation of course work to "1" experience

INNOVATION: Intersession or 4-1-4 Calendar

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Too Numerous to Mention		X			HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation. Interpersonal Orientation Index, Lecture and Discussion Indexes, Critical Thinking Index, and Course Benefits Index. ------------------------------------ Course Comments Questionnaire. (UWGB)--several 5-item scales: overall summary judgment of course, teacher-student rapport, difficulty, organization, general cognitive development, specific cognitive development, and relevance.

IV. DELIVERY SYSTEMS

M. Trimester Calendar Plan - "This plan is built around a calendar that divides the school year into thirds and arranges the academic content into three courses per trimesters or nine courses per year. The 3-3 plan is based on the premise that students will do work of higher quality and engage in more independent study under a less crowded schedule. Also, the larger blocks of time provide more opportunity for instructional experimentation, or for individual learning styles and experiences. (Heiss, 48)

1. Student attitudes, adjustment to college
2. Quality of student work
3. Amount of independent study
4. Amount of instructional experimentation
5. Faculty, administration attitudes
6. History of program, Changes in program-related attitudes, activities over time
7. Goals

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does the amount of information covered decrease as a result of shorter semesters? CHECK: course syllabi before and after innovation

2. Do shorter semesters require more sequence quarters and does this bring about problems of scheduling and faculty? CHECK: school calendar, interview students

INNOVATION: Trimester Calendar Plan

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Pittsburgh Michigan Harper Goucher Dartmouth Carleton Santa Clara Hartwick Raymond College Earlham Lake Forest Parsons				×	Student, faculty, administration IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Individual Personal Development Community Innovation Accountability/Efficiency IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit ------------------------------ HEMEK-II Section A. Measure of educational processes and contexts--college environment, faculty-student relations, campus morale. HEMEK-II Section B. Degree of student academic involvement and intensity. 5 learning styles. HEMEK-I Section B. Measure of a college's educational influence on development of students' opinions and values. 6 attitude scales. HEMEK-I Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attaining educational objectives. 4 progress scales.

continued on p. 2

INNOVATION: Trimester Calendar Plan, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					Course Comments Questionnaire (UWGB). Overall summary judgment of course, teacher-student rapport, difficulty, organization, general and specific cognitive development, relevance.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

N. Modular Course Plan - "In the late 1960s Colordao College introduced a basic unit of 3 1/2 weeks of study followed by a 4 1/2 day break. Each basic unit is known as a module. This plan provides for three types of course: The single course that lasts 3 1/2 weeks, the extended course, that lasts either 7 or 10 1/2 weeks, and adjunct course in music or dance that meet in the late afternoon or evening and extend over a full semester. A classroom is assigned for the exclusive use of each course and professors and students are free to work out arrangements for the best use of their time." (Heiss, 48)

1. Student attitudes, (feelings of restriction?)
2. Student-professor, student-student relations
3. Range of courses offered
4. Faculty, administration reactions
5. Class attendance
6. Student performance, independent study in field
7. History of form. Changes over time
8. Final reports

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Do students receive adequate breadth? CHECK: categories of courses taken

2. Is it just? Is the work homogeneous? Does each module require equal amounts of work? CHECK: module plans

3. Does the module plan reduce cross fertilization of subject matter? CHECK: requires significant experimental design

INNOVATION: Modular Course Plan

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Colorado College Grand Valley State, College IV		X			Faculty, student, and administration IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Vocational Preparation Advanced Training Community Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation Accountability/Efficiency IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Self-Study and Planning Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit OPI. Pre-post testing. 14 scales. HEMEK-III, Section C. Student persona traits and dispositions as a measure for development of general experiences of maturing. HEMEK-II, Section B. Measure of degre of student's academic involvement and intensity. 5 learning styles.

continued on page 2

INNOVATION: Modular Course Plan, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
					Evaluating University Teaching (Wilson). Student and colleague evaluation of teaching behavior and general effectiveness. 5 teacher description scales. HEMEK-IV. Section on teacher course evaluation, specifically the Course Benefits Index.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

O. Varied semester length calendar. Under this plan students take two semesters equal in length, and a short-term of seven or eight weeks. The major purpose of the short-term is to allow students the option of enriching their programs, to graduate with a double major, or to complete the requirements in three years. Variations on the same option are the modified five-term plan, and the five seven week terms plus two four weeks terms"

(Heiss, 49)

1. Satisfaction of objectives
2. Student-faculty-administration attitudes
3. Changes in program over time
4. Student performance

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Does the short semester fit in with the rest of the program? CHECK:

normal school work and short semester work

INNOVATION: Varied Semester Length Calendar

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Bates Judson Northwestern Beloit Ottawa		X		X	Faculty, administration, and student scores on IGI and IFI scales: IGI Academic Development Innovation IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Institutional Esprit --------------- Course Comments Questionnaire (UWGB). Overall summary judgment of course difficulty, organization, general and specific cognitive development, and relevance. HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimate of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. 4 progress scale HEMEK-I, Section B. Measure of degree of a student's academic involvement and intensity. 5 learning styles. HEMEK-I, Section A. Measure of educational processes and contexts: the environment, faculty-student relations campus morale.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

P College Presessions - "As an aspect of their orientation programs some colleges and universities offer presessions in the summer for students who wish to lighten their first semester load or for those need remedial work. These so-called 'head-start' programs have been designed for those whose self-confidence needs bolstering and for those for whom the strain of transion from a small to a larger complex institution might be severe" (Heiss,49)

1. Student attitudes, adjustment to college
2. Participants' performance compared to peers, compared to similar students unexposed
3. Recruitment, number enrolling
4. Rewards for faculty
5. Faculty training
6. Faculty attitudes
7. Availability of financial aids, counseling
8. Evaluation process
9. Attempts to avoid "stigmatization"
10. Administrative attitudes, budget allocations
11. History of program, changes over time

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Do students who attend presessions do better than students who do not attend? CHECK: GPA, drop out rate

INNOVATION: College Presessions

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
University of California--Davis Foothill College Roosevelt University		X			OPI. Pre-post testing. 14 scales. ISS-ACT. Ten non-academic achievement scales. HEMEK-II Section A. College environmental, quality of teaching, and faculty-student relations, and campus morale. HEMEK-II Section B. Measure of students academic involvement and intensity--5 learning styles. HEMEK-II Section C. Influential experiences, specially the notable experiences scale, areas and agents of change, and general satisfaction with college. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation, Course Benefits Index.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Q. The single course schedule - "Several institutions have introduced efforts to re-establish the single course schedule adopted decades ago by Hiram College and by Chapman College. The rationale behind this move was to permit deeper immersion in one broad problem area that then could be examined from the view point of several disciplines." (Heiss, 51)

1. Student attitudes, feelings of restriction
2. Amount of repetition
3. Depth of examination of topic
4. Students performance
5. Required reading
6. Project reports
7. Breadth of course offerings, area of study
8. Interaction in classes, before and after
9. Number of discipline perspectives presented in classes
10. Faculty, administrative attitudes

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV.N.1-3

2. Do students get bored studying only one subject? CHECK: decrease in class size, slackening off of work as course progresses

INNOVATION: Single Course Schedule

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Hiram Chapman Wittenberg Mt. Vernon Jr. College USC Eureka		X		X	Faculty, administration, and student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation Community IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit HEMEK-II, Section A. Measure of a college's environment. 5 CUES scale Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relations; Campus Morale. HEMEK-II, Section B. Measure of degree of students' academic involvement and intensity. 5 learning styl HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation specifically the teacher evaluation form, Critical Thinking Index, and Course Benefits Index. HEMEK-I. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. 4 progress scales.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

Q. The single course schedule - "Several institutions have introduced efforts to re-establish the single course schedule adopted decades ago by Hiram College and by Chapman College. The rationale behind this move was to permit deeper immersion in one broad problem area that then could be examined from the view point of several disciplines." (Heiss, 51)

1. Student attitudes, feelings of restriction
2. Amount of repetition
3. Depth of examination of topic
4. Students performance
5. Required reading
6. Project reports
7. Breadth of course offerings, area of study
8. Interaction in classes, before and after
9. Number of discipline perspectives presented in classes
10. Faculty, administrative attitudes

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV.N.1-3

2. Do students get bored studying only one subject? CHECK: decrease in class size, slackening off of work as course progresses

INNOVATION: Single Course Schedule

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Hiram Chapman Wittenberg Mt. Vernon Jr. College USC Eureka		X		X	Faculty, administration, and student IGI and IFI scores on scales: IGI Academic Development Intellectual Orientation Intellectual/Aesthetic Environment Innovation Community IFI Concern for Undergraduate Learning Concern for Advancing Knowledge Concern for Innovation Institutional Esprit HEMEK-II, Section A. Measure of a college's environment. 5 CUES scal Quality of Teaching and Student-Faculty Relations; Campus Morale. HEMEK-II, Section B. Measure of degree of students' academic involvement and intensity. 5 learning sty HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluatio specifically the teacher evaluation form, Critical Thinking Index, and Course Benefits Index. HEMEK-I. Self-estimates of progres toward attainment of educational objectives. 4 progress scales.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEMS

R Courses by Newspaper - "In the fall of 1973 UCSD will offer a college level newspaper course on the theme "America and the future man" The 20 lectures which will compose the course will be published serially as a public service by approximately 100 newspapers across the nation. The lectures will be designed, to appeal to three audiences (1) the casual reader, (2) the reader who wishes to know more about the topic, and (3) the readers who wish to receive college credit. The latter will register in an affiliated college or university in the area serviced by the newspaper. Students will meet on campus twice during the semester for two sessions of three hours each. A reading kit will be distributed and examinations will be administered by the academic coordinator in the local institution. UC will provide a study guide supplementing materials, a biblography and self-tests, which will allow the reader to pace himself and to check his own progress. These materials will be available to those who wish to take the course without credit, and required for those who take it for credit, (Heiss,38)

1. Enrollment, drop-out figures
2. Students' performance, attitudes
3. Seminar attendancy
4. Couse-wide administration
5. Faculty, administration, attitudes
6. Supplementary materials, etc. picked up by those not enrolled
7. Faculty training
8. Structure, organization, content of course
9. Frequen cy, results of self-tests
10. Discrpancy in goals-results

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV.B.1

2. Is the course popular even amongst those not taking it for credit?

CHECK: rise in newspaper subscription

INNOVATION: Courses by Newspaper

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Univ. of California, San Diego Project Helix, Great Britain		X		X	SIR-ETS. Items concerning courses, exams, course texts. HEMEK-IV. Course Benefits Index. HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. 4 progress scales. Cost/benefit measures. Faculty ratings of student competencies.

IV DELIVERY SYSTEM

S. Computer-aided learning - "One of the most sophisticated electronic instructional system is in the advanced developmental style at the University of Illinois under the titles Plato III on simulated experiences, about government or other topics to students in political science and other departments on campus. Through the use of a television screen and teletypewriters, students can participate in role-playing and decisionmaking experiences as they respond to and receive feedback from data run through the computer facility. "More commonly programmed instruction is used to assist two major categories of learning--the mastery of comcepts and the perfection of skills. The computer assists the first process by serving as a tireless tutor to aid the student, in memorizing certain facts, ideas, or relationships. The second process is aided when the computer is programmed to perform the mathematics involved in a problem the student is asked to solve. Freed from these routine calculations, the learner can concentrate on the structure of the procedures to be followed, and practice the skills those procedures required.

"more sphisticated computer-based programs provide collateral and supplementary experiences in such courses as music theory and musicianship, and it simulated case studies, or game-theory courses. In the field of literature, computers have been used to generate concordances, analyze literacy styles and conduct author attribution studies." (Heiss, 102-106)

1. Pre-post discussion, group learning options
2. Process for answering questions generated by computer program
3. Content organization of computer programs
4. Student, faculty attitudes to computer learning (utilization or feelings of dehumanization)
5. Student performances
6. Cost to institution
7. Planning and development process
8. Amount of help computer provides faculty
9. Electronic difficulties experiences

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is it cost effective? CHECK: possibility of using computer program as a programmed text, cost of installation and repair

INNOVATION: Computer-aided Learning

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRATEGIES	COUN. STRATEGIES	T/S/V STRATEGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Illinois UCI SUNY Potsdam SUNY Albany Oklahoma Christian Grand Valley State John Hopkins Wooster Florida State Texas Univ. of Pennsylvania Florida Atlantic Univ. of West Virginia		X			Davis Student Survey. Section on student projected use of supplemental resources. ISS-ACT. Student evaluation of instructors, institutional policies and practices. HEMEK-IV. Teacher/course evaluation, specifically the Critical Thinking Index and the Course Benefits Index. HEMEK-I, Section B. Assessment of educational influence on development of students' opinions and values. 6 scales. HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimate of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. 4 scales: vocational, humanistic, critical thinking, human relations. Cost/benefit measures. Faculty rating of student competencies.

IV. Delivery Systems

T. TV-Satellite Assisted Learning.

"The Education Commission of the Western States and the Western Interstate Commission on Higher Education . . . are planning to help develop a health education program for the general population to be broadcast to the entire region. For this purpose an experimental satellite will be placed in stationary orbit of the Rocky Mountain region. Its usage will be accessible to many audio and video channels and will provide color and two-way communication and broadcasting.

"Many major institutions now operate fully equipped television studios and master communications centers by means of which intercampus dialogues, interdisciplinary discussions, or in-house programs can be broadcast campus-wide. In courses that rely on demonstration methods, the use of strategically located television screens allows students close-up views of important details. In physical education courses, closed-circuit television is used to record and play back information on motor-skill development and coordination. In the social or behavioral sciences, television is used for the inter-room monitoring of experience, for studying interview techniques, for observing audience reactions, or for self-observation.

"The TV College of the City College of Chicago has been operating since 1965. Since its inception, it has developed a program that has enrolled approximately 70,000 students for credit and another 80,000 for noncredit courses. Students in this program may receive almost all of their college credit by watching televised courses on their home sets, taking examinations at the College Center, and mailing in their completed assignments. The college offers 30 programs in which the student may gain degree credit." (Heiss, pp. 104-05).

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. See IV.B.1

INNOVATION: TV Satellite Assisted Learning

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Cal State, Chico Florida State SUNY Albany Georgia Tech Stanford UCI Oral Roberts Colorado Mountain College TV College, Chicago Columbia College, Chicago Dayton-Miami Valley Consortium Flathead Valley Community College Meharry Medical College Seton Hall		X		X	SIR-ETS. Student assessment of courses and instruction. Items on teaching techniques, courses. HEMEK-IV. Course Benefits Index. HEMEK-I, Section C. Self-estimates of progress toward attainment of educational objectives. 4 progress scales Cost/benefit measures. Faculty rating of student competencies.

IV. Delivery Systems

U. Auto-tutorials and Learning Centers

"A significant number of two-year colleges have introduced auto-tutorial systems that allow students to pace their own learning speed. Using tape recordings or other automated materials the student can control the speed at which he learns, stopping or reversing the presentation at any point in order to review or clarify his own thinking or learning.

"In some cases, auto-tutorial equipment can be used individually. In other cases, it can be used by small or large groups.

"Viewed basically as an activity area, learning centers serve as stimulants to experimentation and innovation. In addition to a wide variety of multi-media recordings, some centers provide a graphic studio, preview rooms and a professional staff. . . . In many cases the center (like the auto-tutorial) serves as a means through which the student can use programmed materials at hiw own pace." (Heiss, pp. 108-09).

1. Cost of operation.
2. Frequency of use. Change over time.
3 Number of staff.
4. Repairs--speed of, frequency of.
5. Training of staff, competence of staff.
6. Training of student users.
7. Changes in learning attributable to use of facilities.

IV. Delivery Systems

U. Auto-tutorials and Learning Centers (continued)

8. Faculty, administrator, student attitudes.

9. Pre-post discussion, group learning options, process for answering questions generated by programs.

10. Physical facilities.

11. Planning, development process.

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Are there equipment problems? CHECK: breakdown and theft rate

2. Are students who can't afford cassettes and players handicapped?

CHECK: availability of loaners and financial assistance

INNOVATION: Auto-Tutorials and Learning Centers

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
1. Auto-Tutorials		X			Davis Student Survey. Sections on student use and evaluation of auxiliary programs, student projected use of remedial and/or supplemental resources, satisfaction ratings of various ratings of campus life.
Bakersfield					
Oakland Community College					
Henry Ford College					
American River College					
Yakima Valley					
North Miami Dade					
Los Angeles Trade and Technical					
Forest Park College					
2. Learning Centers					
Oberlin					
Cortland State					
Elmira					
Fairmont State					
Florida Atlantic University					
SUNY Albany					
College at Old Westbury					
Stephens College, Mo.					
Pennsylvania State					
Oklahoma Christian					

continued on page 2

INNOVATION: Auto-Tutorials and Learning Centers, p. 2

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
UCD					
UCI					
Michigan State					
Macomb Junior College					
Southern Idaho					
Tennessee					

IV. DELIVERY SYSTEMS

V. Credit for Life Experience

1. Possible use of the CLEP
2. Possible use of student portfolios
3. Possible use of simulation and gaming
4. Translation of experience into credits
5. Appeal of colleges giving credit for life experience to older students
6. Ability to use students with particular experiences as a college resource
7. Credit leading to shorter residencies for degrees
8. The teaching institution as a credentialing institution

EVALUATION CHECK POINTS

1. Is the granting of credit standardized? Are all the counselors who grant credit using the same criteria? Are they all applying the criteria uniformly? CHECK: sit in on crediting sessions, make up a fictitous case and see how all the creditors would handle it

2. Are more older students on campus affecting the college environment? CHECK: interviews, standardized instruments on climate

3. Are the new techniques for assessing life experience also being used in standard class room cases? CHECK: sample classes, interview faculty and students

4. Are institutions which give credit for life experience being used as credentialors and then finding that those students who got credit transfered? CHECK: registrar's records

INNOVATION: Credit for Life-Work Experience

INSTITUTIONS	AUDIENCE	T-L STRAT-EGIES	COUN. STRAT-EGIES	T/S/V STRAT-EGIES	EVALUATION STRATEGIES AND TOOLS
Empire State College Minn. Metro. State College Winona State College, Minn. Evergreen State College, Wash. Capitol University Center, Mass. Immaculate Heart College, Los Angeles	X	X		X	CLEP and/or other academic placement exams.